



Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BT 10 .C87 v.5

Current discussions in
theology

Shelf

$\frac{71}{250}$



✓
CURRENT DISCUSSIONS
IN THEOLOGY.

—BY—

THE PROFESSORS

—OF—

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

VOL. V.

BOSTON AND CHICAGO :
Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society.

COPYRIGHT, 1888,
BY CONGREGATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

PREFACE.

THE aim of these DISCUSSIONS is to answer the question, which every earnest student of theology and ecclesiastical subjects may well be supposed to ask at the close of each year, viz. : What has been done in the different fields of sacred learning during the past twelve months, and what are the latest results of such studies ?

In preparing this Report of Progress, critical reference has been made to the most recent literature, as a help to those who wish to prosecute their studies further along the lines indicated, while enough of the fruits of the latest investigation is given to make the work immediately profitable to the student.

In summing up the labors of theologians and critics, the natural drift of the literature leads the reviewer, in most departments, to dwell upon works that deviate somewhat from the beaten path, and in such writings to notice principally what is new and claims to be better than what we already know ; for any adequate account of generally accepted views is precluded by the limits of the work and by the supposition that they are already familiar to the reader. Such considerations, and not any particular sympathy with theological novelties, explain the complexion of these DISCUSSIONS, which may appear to some as giving undue prominence to radical teachings and criticisms. Such con-

siderations account also for the many references to works of foreign origin, especially German, which appear in these pages: if, in some departments, Anglo-Saxon writers are in the minority, the simple reason is, that they produce a much smaller number of books, and naturally less that is new, than do foreign authors.

The sad break in our number, which left the New Testament Department last year without an official representative, has been happily filled by the election of Professor Gilbert, who offers in this volume his first contribution to these DISCUSSIONS.

Several leading publishers have already expressed their readiness to send new works to us for notice in our Annual Review: we would call the attention of others to this matter and request their coöperation. We should be gratified also to receive from authors copies of their writings, especially of monographs or other essays, which cannot be easily obtained through the regular channels.

It should be noticed that the publication in October makes the literary year under review extend about from June to June, so that the present volume follows investigation to the midsummer of 1887.

THE FACULTY.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CHICAGO, OCTOBER 31, 1887.

CONTENTS.

PART FIRST—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

I. OLD TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE OF OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES.

PAGE

CHAPTER I.

GRAMMATICAL AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES	3-7
--	-----

CHAPTER II.

TEXTUAL STUDIES	8-17
---------------------------	------

CHAPTER III.

EXEGETICAL WORKS	18-29
Genesis	18-19
Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua	20
Samuel and Kings	20-22
Solomon's Song	22-23
Isaiah and Jeremiah	24-25
Ezekiel	25-26
Joel	26
Amos and Micah	26-27
Obadiah	27
Habakkuk	28
Targums on Ruth and Jonah	28-29

CHAPTER IV.

OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION	30-53
I. General Works on Introduction	30-37
II. Monographs	37-54
Jeremiah	43
Wisdom Literature	44
Job	45
Proverbs	47
Maccabæan Psalms	50
Isaiah	50
Joel	52

CHAPTER V.

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY	54-62
II. MONOGRAPHS AND ANCIENT HISTORIES .	62-67
Egyptian History	65-66
Chaldea and Ancient Assyria	66-67

CHAPTER VI.

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY	68-70
----------------------------------	-------

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY — CONCLUDED.

II. NEW TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES.

CHAPTER I.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION	73-89
The Pauline Epistles	76
The Catholic Epistles	81
The Gospels	81
The Acts	83
The Apocalypse	84

CHAPTER II.

NEW TESTAMENT TEXT	90-94
------------------------------	-------

CHAPTER III.

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY	95-104
---------------------------------	--------

CHAPTER IV.

NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION	105-124
I. Philological Aids	105
II. Exegesis	115

CHAPTER V.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY	125-128
----------------------------------	---------

PART SECOND—HISTORIC THEOLOGY.

THE MOST RECENT STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY, WITH SOME OF THE
MORE IMPORTANT RESULTS.

INTRODUCTION	131-136
HISTORIC METHODS AND DIVISION	131

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY CHURCH	137-175
I. The Rise and Spread of Christianity	137
II. History of Doctrine	150
III. Church Constitution	163
IV. Christian Worship	169
V. Art in the Early Church	171

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES	176-200
I. Literature of the Sources	176
II. Church Constitution	181
III. The Mediæval Papacy	183
IV. The Monks of the Middle Ages	187
V. History of Doctrine	190
VI. Church Life	198

CHAPTER III.

THE MODERN CHURCH	201-236
I. Introductory	201
II. The Reformation	201
III. The Roman Catholic Church	208
IV. The Greek Church	214
V. The Protestants in Austria-Hungary	215
VI. The Huguenots	216
VII. Church Life in Holland and Belgium	218
VIII. The German Churches	219
IX. The Churches of Great Britain	228
X. The American Churches	233

PART THIRD — SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

THEISM, APOLOGETICS, DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, AND ETHICS.

INTRODUCTORY	239
I. THEISM	239-252
The Self-Revelation of God	239
The Methods of Theism	245
Philosophy of Theism	248
II. APOLOGETICS	252-266
Old Faiths in New Light	252
The Miraculous Element in the Gospels	259
Christian Evidence	266
III. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY	267-284
The Christian Platonists of Alexandria	267
Systematic Theology	271
The New Man	283
IV. ETHICS	285-297
Dorner's Christian Doctrine of Morals	285
The Service of Man	288
V. ESCHATOLOGY	297-307
Kliefoth's Eschatology	297
Future Retribution	303
Probation	306

PART FOURTH—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

I. RECENT STUDIES IN PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

THE PASTOR PERSONALLY	311-316
1. Minister's Vacations	311
2. Ministers as Practical Business-Men	312
3. The English Country Parson as he was and is	313
4. The Support of the English Clergy	315

CHAPTER II.

PARISH WORK	317-330
1. Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor	317
2. Dr. W. Gladden's Parish Problems	321
3. Oxenden's Pastoral Office	329

CHAPTER III.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL	331-335
1. Sunday-School Hymns	331
2. Home Department of the Sunday-School	332
3. Hand-books for Bible Classes	333
4. Outline Normal Lessons	334

CHAPTER IV.

PUBLIC WORSHIP	336-340
1. Uniform Topics for Prayer-Meetings	336
2. Dr. Hatfield's Poets of the Church	338

CHAPTER V.

WORK FOR THE WORLD WITHOUT	341-349
1. Christian Sociology	341
2. Fresh Bait for Fishers of Men	345
3. Mr. D. L. Moody's Work	348

II. HOMILETICS.

CHAPTER I.

THEORETICAL HOMILETICS	354-366
Applied Christianity: Moral Aspects of Social Questions (Gladden)	354
The Clergy and the Labor Question (Farnam)	355
Socialism and Christianity (Behrends)	358

Parish Problems: Hints and Helps for the People of the Churches (Gladden)	360
The Stöcker Sermon Distribution (<i>Andover Review</i>)	363

CHAPTER II.

PRACTICAL HOMILETICS	367-398
The Appeal to Life (Munger)	367
The People's Bible: Discourses upon Holy Scripture (Parker),	375
Bible Warnings: Sermons to Children (Newton)	376
Christ at the Door of the Heart, and other Sermons (Dix)	377
Creed and Character: Sermons (Holland)	378
The Life of Christ in the World: Sermons (A. Brooks)	381
Man's Knowledge of Man and of God: Six Discourses delivered before the University of Dublin at the Donellan Lecture, 1884-5 (Smith)	382
The Marriage Ring: A Series of Discourses in Brooklyn Tabernacle (Talmage)	387
The Parables of Our Saviour (Taylor)	388
Storm Signals (Spurgeon)	389
First Healing and then Service, and other Sermons (Spurgeon)	390
My Sermon-Notes (Spurgeon)	390
Twenty Sermons (P. Brooks)	393
The Transfiguration of Christ (Gunsaulus)	395

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.
OLD TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE
OF
OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES.

BY
REV. SAMUEL IVES CURTISS,
PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, IN CHICAGO
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CHAPTER I.

GRAMMATICAL AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES.

LOWE'S *Hebrew Grammar*, New York, 1887, belongs to a series entitled *The Theological Educator*, edited by Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., editor of *The Expositor*. It is a very serviceable little book, and yet it does not introduce the student to the right method of studying Hebrew, which is the same as that of learning any modern language. It really represents the old method of studying the principles of grammar apart from the exercises. The writer is convinced from observation and personal experience that this is not the best way to learn a language, or to acquire the power to read easy Hebrew at sight.

This result cannot be readily attained with any grammar constructed on the principle of Lowe's manual. Indeed, the way to learn any language, even though it may be dead, is to treat it as though it were living. In this respect Harper's *Method and Manual*¹ in competent hands is adapted to do a far better service than any hand-book, which follows the methods of the old school of Hebrew grammarians.

It is held by most of the modern grammarians that the Hebrew verb does not exhibit any distinctions of tense, but

¹ Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1885, Vol. iii, p. 32.

rather of action or state, in the past, present, or future. Hence the tense is not indicated by the verb, but by the stand-point of the writer. The contrasted terms future and perfect are regarded as unscientific. An action then is considered either as complete or incomplete in the past, present, or future.¹ It is affirmed by those who are authorities that this peculiarity is characteristic of the Semitic family of languages.²

In *Hebraica* Mr. W. H. Bennett,³ Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, England, has set himself to work to defend the old terminology of "past and future" by an analysis of the Pentateuch and Joshua. While his array of facts seems to be overwhelmingly in favor of his theory, yet the method indicated renders his results doubtful, and the question arises whether he is sufficiently familiar with

¹ Cf. Ewald, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes*, Göttingen, 1870, p. 348ff.; Davidson, *An Introductory Hebrew Grammar*, Edinburgh, 1876, pp. 49ff., 114ff.; Stade, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1879, p. 16, says of the Semitic languages: "Doch fehlt ihnen die Möglichkeit im Verbum die Zeiten zu scheiden, in welche die Handlung fällt. Dafür ist die Unterscheidung, ob die Handlung vollendet und unvollendet, ein nicht gleichwerthiger Ersatz," and p. 227; Kautzsch-Gesenius, *Hebräische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1881, pp. 103f., 279ff.; Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, Oxford, 1881; Müller, *Outlines of Hebrew Syntax*, p. 1ff.; König, *Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1881, p. 150; Strack, *Hebräische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1883, p. 58; Böttcher, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1866, p. 379, holds essentially the same distinction, although he uses the terms "perfect" and "fiens."

² See Stade above. Cf. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, London, 1874, Vol. i, pp. 53ff., 1875, Vol. ii, p. 1ff.; Dillmann, *Grammatik der Aethiopischen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1857, pp. 135ff., Schröder, *Die Phönizische Sprache*, Halle, 1869, p. 193, Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, Halle, 1875, p. 367ff.

³ *Notes on the Use of the Hebrew Tenses, Hebraica*, Chicago, 1886, Vol. ii, pp. 193-208; Vol. iii, pp. 22-29.

the principles of comparative Semitic grammar, or even with the works on Hebrew grammar, properly to treat this subject. Since others have manifested the same skepticism as Mr. Bennett regarding the modern theory of the perfect and imperfect, and since the subject is one of the highest importance in the interpretation of the Old Testament, it seems desirable to indicate the works where the modern view is stated and defended.

The twenty-first volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* contains an interesting and important article on the *Semitic languages*¹ by Nöldeke. Perhaps no living scholar is more competent to treat of this subject than he.

He says that all Semitic languages are descendants of an original Semitic language long since extinct.² It was once a favorite theory that the Arabic is very closely related to this primitive Semitic language.³ But as we now recognize more and more that the Sanscrit is far from preserving the features of the primitive Indo-European language, to the degree that we had supposed until recently, so in our domain we can attribute only a relative preëminence to the Arabic.⁴ Nevertheless we must begin with the Arabic in our reconstruction of the common Semitic language.⁵

He speaks of the efforts which have been made to establish the relationship between the Semitic and the Indo-

¹ He has also published it in pamphlet form, *Die Semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig, 1887, "with many corrections and additions," from which our quotations are made.

² *Ibid.* p. 3.

³ Olshausen, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache*, Braunschweig, 1861, pp. 7-8.

⁴ *Die Semitischen Sprachen*, p. 4.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 5.

European family of languages,¹ but declares that they have utterly failed. Although he considers it probable that these as well as the other groups of languages have come from a common stock, yet the separation occurred at so early a period that the common features have been entirely obliterated.² The Hebrew and Phœnician are merely dialects of one language.³ Their consonantal character is the same,⁴ but we are far from being acquainted with the phonetic character of the Hebrew language in the days of David and Isaiah.⁵

In another place⁶ Nöldeke has subjected Friedrich Delitzsch's *Prolegomena to a New Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*⁷ to a searching criticism. He says that it too often makes the impression of being written to advocate the Assyrian, whose importance for Hebrew — at the present stage of knowledge — it sets too high, while other helps, especially Arabic, it puts far too low.⁸

He admits that Assyrian is more closely related to Hebrew grammatically than Aramaic, but complains that Delitzsch has not pointed out the deeply marked peculiarities of the Assyrian,⁹ which render it a far stranger language to the Hebrew student than Aramaic. He criticises

¹ Cf. Delitzsch, *Studien über Indogermanisch-Semitische Wurzelverwandtschaft*, Leipzig, 1873; and McCurdy, *Aryo-Semitic Speech*, Andover.

² *Die Semitischen Sprachen*, p. 17.

³ *Ibid.* p. 16.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 26.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 18.

⁶ *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Leipzig, 1886, pp. 718-743.

⁷ Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, Vol. iv, Chicago, 1886, p. 21.

⁸ *Z. D. M. G.*, Leipzig, 1886, p. 719.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 721.

his belief in the integrity of the Hebrew text, and shows how this belief has led Delitzsch to explain forms through the medium of the Assyrian which have simply arisen through the corruption of the text.¹ In conclusion he says that the *Prolegomena* and Delitzsch's essay on *The Hebrew Language Viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research*² show how important it is that he should set forth his theories for examination before they are published in the authoritative form of a lexicon. While he recognizes that we may reckon on a positive gain from the study of Assyrian for lexicography, he thinks a loss will be experienced in the discovery that the Old Testament text has suffered many incurable injuries, and that many single words may be strongly suspected of having undergone serious changes, so that *non liquet* must play a great rôle in Hebrew lexicons.³

¹ *Z. D. M. G.*, Leipzig, 1886, p. 731.

² Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1885, Vol. iii, p. 29.

³ *Ibid.* p. 743.

CHAPTER II.

TEXTUAL STUDIES.

IT has been a favorite theory that we have in the Massoretic text of the Old Testament a text which possesses final authority, and that the various versions have sprung from inferior sources. The signs of the times seem to indicate that this theory will be set aside. In the seventeenth century the author¹ of the Helvetic formula of consensus² in its second Canon, adopting the opinion of the younger Buxtorf, declared that the consonants and the vowel points were inspired.³ It was soon shown that this position was untenable,⁴ but there has been a tacit understanding among theologians that at least the consonants of the Massoretic text possess final authority. This was substantially the position unwisely taken, as it seems to us, by our American Old Testament Revision Company.⁵ It is certain that the

¹ This was John Henry Heidegger, who composed it in the year 1675. See Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. i, New York, 1884, p. 478.

² The name is *Formula Consensus Helvetica*.

³ Cf. Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, Lipsiae, 1840. The language used is "*tum quoad consonans, tum quoad vocalia*."

⁴ By Capellus, *De Punctorum Vocalium et Accentuum apud Hebraeos vera ac germana Antiquitate*, and *Arcani Punctuationis*, etc., Amstelodami, 1689.

⁵ See Appendix to the Oxford edition, "*Classes of Passages*, vi. Omit from the margin all renderings from the LXX, Vulgate, and other ancient versions or authorities."

Septuagint version held as high a position in the early church as our Hebrew text does to-day.¹ To be sure it contains books which are rightfully excluded from the Canon since they do not occur in the Hebrew, and did not receive the sanction of the New Testament writers through quotations from them, or even of the Alexandrians themselves;² otherwise the Massoretic text can hardly lay a higher claim to being God's inspired word than the Septuagint, hence textual criticism is as truly in place in the Old Testament as in the New. The reason that the Massoretic text has gained the ascendancy over any version, since the time of the Reformation, is perhaps due to its containing only the canonical books, and to the scrupulous care with which these have been preserved. Even this care has not prevented modern Jews from pronouncing the same vowels in four or five different ways.³ This scrupulous effort to preserve the exact vowels of the text does not extend farther back than the sixth century, A.D.⁴ Before that time Hebrew was written with consonants only, the pronunciation was quite different in the time of Jerome,⁵ and there were some variations between his Hebrew text and ours. In the Talmudical period there was a conscientious care of the text. All this is admitted by the critics, but preceding their time there was greater freedom in the

¹ Cf. Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*, New York, 1884, p. x.

² Cf. Herzog and Plitt, *Real-Encyclopädie*, Leipzig, 1877, Vol. i, p. 284.

³ Cf. Savoureux, *Études Historiques et Exégétiques sur l'Ancien Testament*, Paris, 1887, p. 125. He says that if Moses were to hear the reading of the Torah in a modern synagogue he would not understand anything.

⁴ Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, Vol. i, 1883, p. 72.

⁵ Cf. Siegfried, *Die Aussprache des Hebräischen bei Hieronymus*, in *Stade's Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1884, pp. 34-83.

transmission of the text and at the same time greater difficulty.

It has commonly been urged by conservative scholars that the Septuagint version was not only made from an inferior text, but also that it was made by those who had an imperfect knowledge of Hebrew.¹ The facts, however, do not seem wholly to sustain this theory. We observe freedom in the quotation of passages from the Old Testament in the New, which in some cases may be due to lapses of memory or more often to a text differing from our own.² It may be said that these divergences are intentional, and that the Holy Spirit who empowered the original writers to make their communication empowered the New Testament writers to modify it. The same ground is held as to variations that occur in parallel passages of the Old Testament. But this does not seem to represent the facts. The sacred writers were undoubtedly limited in their transmission of the Scriptures by the modes of writing and the habits of authorship at the times in which they lived.

No manner of transmitting manuscripts could be more scrupulously exact than that of the Massoretes, yet we find some variations among them which it was impossible for them to avoid. The scribes in the Talmudical age doubtless took all pains carefully to transmit the Scriptures by means of consonantal writing, but they had an instrumentality inferior to that employed by the Massoretes, and their predecessors experienced still greater difficulty when they had Hebrew letters³ which were quite different from the

¹ Cf. the writer's article in *Current Discussions in Theology*, 1883, Vol. i, Chicago, p. 79.

² Cf. Toy, *Quotations*, p. 13.

³ Scholars generally agree that these characters were essentially the same

square characters, which were perhaps introduced two hundred years B.C. Certainly we should expect, under these circumstances, to find the same phenomena illustrated in the Old Testament text as in the New.

This is not a question to be settled by theologians, but by historical investigation. While it is destructive of any theory of verbal inspiration of the Old Testament, it is not of an essential inspiration. While ideas are dependent on words, no one will assume that our ancestors in the sixteenth century did not possess the classics, because the principles of modern text criticism had not been applied. And it is certainly true that all that is essential to God's Word may be found in any one of the versions that has been honestly made. No intelligent believer need tremble for the ark of God because of textual criticism, for it is simply an honest effort to ascertain the original state of the text.

Several works have appeared during the last two years bearing on this subject. We certainly read with some surprise the title *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, edited by Professor Cornill*.¹ This title, however, indicates, as he says, precisely what he has attempted to do. The text of Ezekiel as is attested by all the introductions is exceedingly corrupt. He has simply undertaken to follow out the methods of the best classical critics with reference to Ezekiel in trying to restore the text to its original form.

as those found on the Moabite stone. The genuineness of this inscription has recently been called in question by a writer in the *Scottish Review*, April, 1887; but German scholars are almost unanimous in accepting its genuineness. For the text, see Smend und Socin, *Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab*, Freiburg, I. B., 1886.

¹ *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, herausgegeben von Lic. Dr. Carl Heinrich Cornill, Leipzig, 1886.

He considers the Septuagint a first-class witness to the condition of the text at least three hundred and fifty years before the achetype indicated by our Massoretic text. He finds in the translation of the Septuagint what seems to him to be a very careful effort to reproduce the text of the Hebrew original at the expense of the Greek idiom. This care is manifested in the transcription of certain words whose meaning is unknown to the translator, but where he might have guessed at a passable translation.

He also assigns a high place to the Targum, which, although not written down until a relatively late period, preserves a careful rendering of the Hebrew text which was conscientiously handed down by tradition from a time anterior to the Christian era. He also assigns a place to the Peshitto and to Jerome's version.

He holds that the text critic should be so imbued with the spirit of the author, and so completely under his control, that as a last resort, in cases where the text seems to be hopelessly corrupt and the versions do not indicate what the true reading should be, he can conjecture the word or words which his author must have written. He acknowledges the delicacy of such a task, which in the hands of an unskilled or presumptuous critic would be attended with serious consequences.¹

He shows how little is to be expected from the comparison of manuscripts which have grown up under the influence of the Massora by stating that the oldest dated Old Testament manuscript, the *Codex Petropolitanus*,² furnishes only sixteen variants in the forty-eight long chapters of Ezekiel.

¹ *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, herausgegeben von Lic. Dr. Carl Heinrich Cornill, Leipzig, 1886.

² This is the oldest Hebrew manuscript bearing a genuine date. It is from the year 916 A.D.

In view of this fact the promised Massoretic text of the Old Testament by Dr. Ginsburg excites less interest, especially since Dr. Baer, who with Prof. Delitzsch has issued several books of the Old Testament, and who is an acknowledged authority in these matters, complains that Dr. Ginsburg's Massora, which would form the basis of such a work, is an uncritical compilation of the most diverse statements from the most varying sources in which some real Massoras are wanting; and since it is merely a bundle of materials, from which a historico-critical Massora must still be prepared.¹

A posthumous work by Eugene Le Savoureux,² a French pastor, contains an instructive discussion regarding the Hebrew text of the Old Testament before and after the Exile, as well as concerning the Massora and the Massoretic text. His positions with regard to text criticism are those which are commonly adopted by the modern critical school.

Prof. Smith, of Lane Seminary, argues that the Septuagint version of Jeremiah³ was derived from a better text than the one preserved by the Synagogue, hence that the Septuagint is a source for the text of the very first importance. He thinks that by judicious criticism it is possible to construct from the Septuagint and the Massoretic text a better text of Jeremiah than now exists.

Prof. Ryssel, of Leipzig, in his investigations concerning the form of the text and the genuineness of the book of

¹ Cf. Baer's review of Ginsburg's Massora, *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Leipzig, 1886, pp. 743-758.

² *Études Historiques et Exégétiques sur l'Ancien Testament*, Paris, 1887. These essays, with others which have not been republished, originally appeared in the *Revue Chrétienne*, and in the *Bulletin théologique*.

³ *The Text of Jeremiah, Hebraica*, New Haven, 1887, Vol. iii, pp. 193-200.

Micah,¹ calls a halt in these studies. He says that the main object of his treatise is to work against a false estimate of the value of the versions. He holds as an axiom that of two readings the more difficult should have the preference, as likely to be original. This has been disputed by Stade, who mentions that Hupfeld characterized such a principle as a "Freibrief für Unsinn."²

Ryssel says: "From a comparison of all the deviations of the old translation from the exact form of the Massoretic text it will appear—at least in the case of Micah and the other prophetic books—that on the basis of the old versions nothing can be done for the correction of the corrupt passages of the Hebrew text."

Klostermann, who belongs to the conservative school, following in the footsteps of Thenius³ and Wellhausen,⁴ has prepared a commentary on the books of Samuel and Kings, in which he has made extensive use of the versions in modifying the text of these books, which, as is well known, is very corrupt.

He says,⁵ "The primitive text of our books is lost." The text which came from this was a consonantal text, in which there were various abbreviations. It was preserved with all possible care in a strange land, although with many disadvantages, after the national life had been cut off through the Exile. "The Massoretic text contains the last

¹ *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha*, Leipzig, 1887.

² *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 373.

³ *Die Bücher Samuelis*, Leipzig, 1864.

⁴ *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, Göttingen, 1871.

⁵ Klostermann, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, Nördlingen, 1887, p. 36ff.

edition and recension of this text." Into it have passed glosses and orthographical variants as though they were a part of the text. The Septuagint and its forerunner were designed as a preparation for the public reading in the Jewish Synagogue. It has preserved the color of the Hebrew and has retained Hebrew expressions which were obscure to the translator, but in view of the corruptions that have befallen the text of the Septuagint he thinks there is no other way than to follow the course proposed by Lagarde.¹

Klostermann's position is fully in accord with that of Strack, who is a co-editor with Zöckler of the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, who has devoted especial study to Hebrew manuscripts,² and who says: "A glance at the larger editions of the New Testament shows that even the oldest manuscripts exhibit very diverse readings; that, therefore, the transmission of the text was very early disfigured through mistakes. The manuscripts of the Old Testament are absolutely about half a millennium younger, relatively at least seven centuries, and yet they afford on the whole the same text which was pronounced correct by the Massoretes. Hence, in the Old Testament division, with all recognition of the Massoretes we must more frequently use the old translations in the examination of the original text (especially the Greek versions, the Targums and the translation of Jerome) than in the New. Even conjecture cannot be entirely excluded."³

¹ Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, 1885, Vol. iii, p. 22ff.

² Harkavy und Strack, *Catalog der Hebräischen Bibelhandschriften der Kaiserlichen Oeffentlichen Bibliothek in St. Petersburg*, St. Petersburg, 1875; *Prophetarum Posteriorum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus*. edidit Hermannus Strack, Petropoli, 1876.

³ *Die Propheten Jesaia und Jeremia*, Nördlingen, pp. 7, 8.

A Dutch pastor who has recently written¹ on this subject occupies a conservative position. According to him the Massoretic text does not at all stand on the same plane as the original autographs. This must indeed be conceded by all who know the history of the text.² He regards it simply as the basis or starting point of further criticism, since it was the result of a reaction from too free a treatment of the text, and was produced because there was need of having a fixed norm in view of the different readings and variants. He holds, therefore, that the receptus (the received Massoretic text) "was made, not born;" that a certain copy was made the authorized standard, which was reproduced with the utmost fidelity, and that all copies not agreeing with it were destroyed as far as possible.

He speaks of the piety and earnestness of the men who transmitted this text, and who still knew Hebrew as their mother tongue. This text, he says, we should treat without vowels and without division into verses and paragraphs, and we are to depart from it only in case of the most pressing necessity. To this category belong evident errors in writing, clear additions from later times, changes which have been made in the interest of a tendency (*tendentieuze veranderingen*), impossible grammatical forms, etc., in all of which cases critical conjecture is not only permitted, but is imperatively necessary.

¹ Gunning, *De Godspraken van Amos vertaald en verklaard*, Leiden, 1885, p. 5. I give a free quotation at considerable length, because this writer seems to combine a critical and reverential spirit in the treatment of Scripture, and because he views the subject from the practical stand-point of a pastor.

² Cf. Dillmann, *Bibeltext des A. T.* in Herzog and Plitt's *Real-Encyclopädie*, Leipzig, 1878, Vol. ii, p. 388, where he quotes from the Talmud that the Hebrew text of that period was formed by the comparison of three manuscripts.

Next, light is to be sought from the oldest translations, among which the Septuagint, on account of its antiquity, must be considered by far the most important, whose variants certainly do not in every case lead to the conclusion of a Hebrew reading differing from that which we possess, since undoubtedly in many cases copyists and translators have incorporated all sorts of pieces of their own; but many variants from our traditional text found in the Septuagint stood in the Hebrew original which the Alexandrians used. These readings we can compare with those of the Massorettes, and can often adopt them to advantage.

He emphasizes the fact that the Massoretic text occupies the first place, and speaks of the "fearfully arbitrary grounds" (*schromelijk willekeurige gronden*) on which in many cases the customary reading has been rejected by the critics. While admitting the limited view of the Massorettes he condemns a treatment of the text which is really a vivisection. He says that the transposition of verses, of paragraphs, of entire chapters, the erasure of letters, words, and meanings which we do not really know how to reconcile with our knowledge of Hebrew; the indication of defects and *lacunae* of duplicates and pleonasms, often upon no other grounds than those of the "subjective taste" and "sense of beauty" of different learned men,—all this seems to him an unholy and unwarrantable procedure.

Such investigations are doubtless attended with danger. Unbelievers take advantage of them, and those who are weak in the faith may be injuriously disturbed; but while God tempers the wind to the shorn lamb, he has not seen fit to prevent the winds of criticism which serve to purify what might become the stagnant waters of tradition.

CHAPTER III.

EXEGETICAL WORKS.

Bartlett and Peters' *Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian, arranged for Young Readers*,¹ is the united product of two young American Hebrew scholars. The object of the work is stated in the preface of the first volume: "The contents of this volume are Hebrew tradition and history from the Creation to the Captivity. The story is told in the words of the Bible, but with considerable condensation and re-arrangement." They have added explanatory glosses: "where these glosses consist of more than one or two words, and are not mere condensations of longer statements in the original, they are included in marks of parenthesis."

While adopting the results of recent criticism they have used the language of the Authorized Version in their translation, or the language of the Revision.

The book is likely to be quite as useful for ministers and theological students as for the youthful readers, for whom it was especially prepared.

GENESIS.—The Commentary on Genesis by Gossrau² is from a strictly conservative stand-point. The tone of the

¹ New York, 1886.

² *Commentar zur Genesis*, Halberstadt, 1887.

book is polemic and apologetic. The essential contents of the preface according to Budde¹ is designed to prove: (1) "Moses could and must have written Genesis; (2) the divine names are everywhere used, as they must have been used, according to the supposition that the book was composed by one author. . . . 'In Elohim God's omnipotence is indicated; Jehovah is so called as the one always remaining the same, the eternal benefactor and friend of mankind; hence he is thus called as the covenant God of Israel, who for this reason is especially gracious to this people.'"

It does not seem probable that this work, which is from an obscure author and which deals largely in quotations, is likely to have any influence on the course of German exegesis.

Whatever may be the attitude that scholars may take in regard to Dillmann's critical positions, all must unite in admiring the thoroughness, conscientiousness, and wealth of his scholarship, which render his commentaries on the Pentateuch a perfect thesaurus for the critical student. His critical position has already been indicated in a previous volume.²

A new edition of his commentary on Genesis appeared last year, the fifth in the series of the *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch*, but the third of his own. While his first edition³ was based on Knobel, the last two have become so independent as to be entirely his own. The last edition contains fourteen pages more, through various additions which he has made, principally with reference to recent works by Kuenen and Budde.

¹ Cf. the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 441.

² Cf. *Current Discussions*, Chicago, 1885, Vol. iii, p. 36ff.

³ Leipzig, 1875. His second edition appeared in 1882, and the last in 1886.

NUMBERS, DEUTERONOMY, AND JOSHUA.—It is probable that no commentary has been looked for with so much interest as that of Dillmann on these books,¹ not on account of their exegetical character so much as because Dillmann stands opposed to the views of Wellhausen regarding the origin of the Priests' Code. These views we shall present in their place. This volume has been warmly received even by those who oppose Dillmann's critical views.²

An English work by Lloyd on *The Book of Joshua*³ seems to promise very little for the critical study of the book. It does not attempt to solve any of the critical questions. Perhaps the author wisely ignores them, although he does not seem to be conscious of them. The commentary bristles with Hebrew words, and may in this respect be of service to the Hebrew student.

SAMUEL AND KINGS.—A commentary on these books⁴ by Klostermann belongs to a series of exegetical hand-books which are being issued by Strack and Zöckler on the Old and New Testaments.⁵ This commentary is prepared with great care on the basis of textual studies, as we have already seen.

¹ Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, Leipzig, 1886.

² Cf. Stade's review in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 193.

³ London, 1886. Some of the contributors to *Current Discussions* have been criticised for making such use of German works to the exclusion of English. Only ignorance of the comparative poverty of the English language in really good original works on the Old Testament can justify such a criticism.

⁴ *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, Nördlingen, 1887.

⁵ The general name is *Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments sowie zu den Apokryphen*.

Recently, Harnack and Schürer have placed all of Zöckler's manuals under the ban in an unworthy if not in a discourteous way. Harnack especially assumes a tone which is likely to give a false impression regarding this series. He says: "Within the Protestant ranks at the present time there are two classes of workers standing side by side, who have scarcely anything more in common with each other. The one investigates earnestly, and the others quiet the race of ministers who have been trained by them through numerous new works, manuals, and compendiums. One always knows beforehand what stands in them. Only the fashion is more or less new."¹ Schürer says, with reference to a New Testament commentary in this series: "I think even the most modest interpretation, when it is intended for theologians, should not proceed as though we still lived in the seventeenth century, and nothing had transpired since then."²

Such language is certainly unbecoming a critic of Schürer's standing, and has very properly called forth an energetic protest on the part of Zöckler.³

Schürer, however, maintains with emphasis that while his expressions may be taken hyperbolically, in regard to Zöckler's series belonging to the Catholic style of interpretation, and to that of the theologians of the seventeenth century, "yet in one main point the Lutheran theologians of the seventeenth century agree with the Catholics in the method of theological investigation. The one as well as the other are bound by tradition. But this is also true of the modern theologians who call themselves Lutheran ;

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, 1886, p. 554ff.

² *Ibid.* pp. 532-539.

³ *Wider die unfehlbare Wissenschaft*, Nördlingen, 1887.

and precisely in this consists their relationship with both these. . . . In all departments, in dogmatics and church history, in the Old and New Testaments, the traditional opinions consciously or unconsciously furnish the standard of judgment.”¹ He sees signs, however, of yielding, and expresses the hope that this kind of theology will give way.

From our American stand-point there are few Old Testament scholars who take such advanced positions as Klostermann and Orelli, who are still classed with those who follow the traditional methods.

Lumby has prepared the volume on the first Book of Kings for *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*. The work seems to be well done.²

SOLOMON'S SONG.—Schegg, a Roman Catholic professor in the University of Munich, has prepared a translation and commentary on Solomon's Song.³ The translation is in blank verse. He presents it as a dramatic poem in two parts, each containing two acts and several scenes. The *dramatis personæ* are: Solomon, Shulamith, the queen-mother, the chorus, including the women of the harem, the maid servants of the queen-mother, the maid servants of Shulamith, and her young companions, bands of people. The theater is Judea, the Lebanon, and Upper Galilee.

He alludes to the fact that Solomon's Song has been called the most difficult book of the Old Testament, and that the reason why its reception into the Canon was

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, 1887, pp. 241, 242.

² Cambridge. With reference to the series, Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, 1885, Vol. iii, p. 35.

³ Schegg, *Das Hohe Lied Salomo's von der heiligen Liebe*, München, 1885.

justified by the Synagogue was because Solomon was considered its author.

In his introductory remarks he says: "Solomon's Song describes the reciprocal love of Solomon and Shulamith, a shepherdess, who combines with perfect beauty and strength of character, touching simplicity of heart and childlike innocence. The poem contains the representation of the history of a heart in which the frame of mind is expressed sometimes in solo, sometimes antiphonally. That which raises this poem to such an exalted place over all related poems of antiquity is the wonderful harmony of bridal love and unmixed purity of heart. The high nobility of love cannot be better brought to light."

He protests against the comparison of Solomon's Song with the Indian idyl, Gita Gowinda, *i. e.*, the love of the god Krishna and the shepherdess Radha, and gives the best of reasons.

He holds that Shulamith is an ideal. Solomon could not have raised a country maiden to the position of a favorite^{*}wife. Such a step would have brought about trouble with the daughter of Pharaoh.

He thinks it significant that Solomon should glorify virgin love, and considers the Song as indicating more than the victory of true love over the seducer, more than the spring-time of love in single songs, or a hymn upon marriage in its original institution. In the earthly copy was recognized the heavenly original of the union of God with his chosen people, and, in the days of the filling of the Son of God with the human nature, his union with the Church, and with every soul who gives himself entirely to him. In a word, the allegorical character of the Song was recognized embracing all times.¹

¹ Schegg, *Das Hohe Lied Salomo's von der heiligen Liebe*, München, 1885. *Einleitende Vorbemerkungen*, p. 3ff.

ISAIAH AND JEREMIAH.—Bredenkamp has begun the preparation of a commentary on Isaiah, of which the first twelve chapters have appeared. Although he belongs to the strictly conservative school, he occupies the following position: "The question concerning the authenticity of that which is contained in Isaiah can only be decided on the individual explanation of the parts in question. The examination must be carried on without dogmatic presuppositions, which can be done all the more easily, as the value of the prophecies does not at all depend upon answering the question of authorship. . . . The possibility of foreign elements, so far as we are concerned, is not excluded; the existence of them is emphatically to be proved. It does not follow from the recognition of the marvelous knowledge of the prophets regarding individual things, that Isaiah possessed the same in respect to the Babylonian Exile. We can therefore carry on investigations on all sides free and unhindered."¹

Strack, in his preface to Orelli's commentary on Isaiah and Jeremiah, indicates a decided change, during the past few years, in the position of conservative scholars with reference to the authorship of the former prophecy. While he holds firmly in general that in "the Old Testament we have God's word, and a sufficiently trustworthy account concerning the history of revelation, he maintains that the traditional views regarding the origin of many Old Testament books are wanting a tenable foundation, as earnest investigation has proved and ever will prove, which seeks only to learn the truth, and does not attempt to prove a

¹ The writer is dependent on Kamphausen's notice of Bredenkamp's Commentary in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 170, for the notice of this book, as he failed through an oversight to secure a copy in time for review.

definite proposition. The interpretation of the second main part of the book, which now bears the name of Isaiah, and later that of the appendices to the Book of Zechariah, will show that the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament do not lose in dignity, but gain in clearness, and thereby in value for the reader, when the certain results of earnest science take the place of views which have stood for centuries, but which are not supported in a convincing way by any ancient tradition.”¹

With reference to the Massoretic text of Jeremiah, Orelli occupies a conservative position. He shows that while hitherto such scholars as Ewald, Schrader, and Kuenen have given this text the preference over the Alexandrian, while conceding to one about as much authority as the other, Nägelsbach, Keil, Graf, and others have maintained the critical inferiority and total untrustworthiness of the Septuagint with reference to this book. The conclusion that Orelli reaches is that since the translator does not appear to be concerned about the exact translation of the original, but only to give approximately the sense, whether in a fuller or briefer form, his work is evidently not adapted for the reproduction of an independent Hebrew text. Instead of having two forms of the text, which are to be considered, he says we have merely a Hebrew recension, and a wholly untrustworthy translation which, at most, can be regarded only a secondary or tertiary source in the establishment of the text. He therefore concludes that the Septuagint is superior to the Massoretic text only in certain passages, and can be used to correct them.

EZEKIEL.—Cornill furnishes simply a text and transla-

¹ See *Die Propheten Jesaja und Jeremias*, Nördlingen, 1887, p. 8.

tion of Ezekiel, with comments which are limited to the criticism of the text. This text is without points, because he did not feel that he was competent to supply the accents, therefore he considered it better to omit the vowels altogether.¹ The number of those who can read Hebrew fluently and correctly without the vowels among Christians in any country is very small. It would have served a better purpose if the editor had supplied the vowel points.

JOEL.—A Roman Catholic theologian has recently published a commentary on this book,² concerning whose date there is so much uncertainty among critics ; some considering it one of the oldest of the written prophecies that have come down to us, others like Vatke, Hilgenfeld, Wellhausen, and Stade maintaining that it did not originate until after the Exile. Scholz adopts the same view, and holds that Joel was a contemporary of Zechariah, who entered on his public activity in the second year of Darius, 519 B. C., and that he is dependent on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, etc.

Scholz thinks that the plague of locusts and the drouth described in this book (ii. 2-11) are actual plagues, visited by God in the time of Joel, which the prophet considered as part of the final judgment, just as Isaiah regarded the Assyrian and Jeremiah the Chaldean catastrophes.

AMOS AND MICAH.—Commentaries on Amos and Micah have already been noticed in another connection. Gunning, besides an interesting discussion of text criticism³ with

¹ *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, herausgegeben von Lic. Dr. Carl Heinrich Cornill, Leipzig, 1886, p. 160.

² Scholz, *Commentar zum Buche des Propheten Joel*, Würzburg, 1885.

³ *De Godspraken van Amos*, Leiden, 1885, pp. 5-11.

reference to Amos, furnishes quite a full list of works bearing on the interpretation of the prophet.¹

Ryssel in his commentary on Micah not only treats of the character of the text,² but also of the results of the critical investigation of the text,³ and its authenticity.⁴ The position of Ryssel with regard to questions of text criticism, as has already been observed, is strictly conservative, more so indeed than that of Strack or Klostermann.

OBADIAH.—This prophecy, which comprises only twenty-one verses, has been made the subject of an “inaugural dissertation” by a Dr. Johannes of Würzburg,⁵ who seems to be a follower of Scholz. After giving the literature⁶ he treats of the prophet himself, his prophecy and style of writing, his relation to Joel, Amos, and Jeremiah, and the time in which he lived, with its historical characteristics.⁷ This is followed by the contents and division of the prophecy, the translation,⁸ and the comments.⁹ He holds, in opposition to those who consider that Obadiah was a contemporary of Ahab, Joram, or Uzziah, that he did not prophesy until about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, perhaps during the years 588--575 B.C. He argues, in opposition to the majority of interpreters, that he shows a dependence on Jeremiah. It is in this way mainly that he reaches the conclusion that has been indicated.

¹ *De Godspraken van Amos*, Leiden, 1885, pp. 5-11.

² *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha*, Leipzig, 1887, *Die Beschaffenheit des Textes*, pp. 1-10.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 144-198.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 199-282.

⁵ *Commentar zu der Weissagung des Propheten Obadja*, Würzburg, 1885.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 5, 6.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 1-21.

⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 21-23.

⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 24-84.

HABAKKUK.—A French scholar has devoted a volume of two hundred and thirty-six pages to the interpretation of this prophecy.¹ In the preface he claims that it is his object to give quotations from some of the most celebrated rabbinical commentaries relative to the book of Habakkuk. While it is legitimate to make such references, it must be remembered that the rabbins knew nothing of the true science of exegesis. At the same time Baumgartner has evidently made considerable use of the writings of modern commentators. The following is the plan of the book: An introduction to the prophecy, treating of the prophet according to tradition, the time when it was composed, giving the principal opinions concerning the various epochs to which it is assigned by the critics, with an appendix on the historicity of Manasseh's captivity.² Then follows a discussion of the unity of the book and the normal division of the text, a translation and commentary, closing with a general catalogue of works relating to the prophecy.³ He adopts as the date of this book the end of the reign of Manasseh, about 645 B.C., and defends the historicity of the account of this king's captivity as given in 2 Chron. xxxiii.

TARGUMS ON RUTH AND JONAH.—A young American scholar has made a plea for the study of Aramaic in the regular course of our theological seminaries.⁴ The reasons which he urges are certainly sufficient. He says: "A

¹ Baumgartner, *Le Prophète Habakuk, Introduction critique et exégèse avec examen spécial des commentaires rabbiniques du talmud et de la tradition*, Genève, 1885.

² *Ibid.* pp. 3-74.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 75-232.

⁴ *The Targums on the Books of Ruth and Jonah, literally translated from the Chaldee* by Oliver T. Crane, B.A., New York, 1886.

language in which inspired thought has been directly written ; which has exerted such important influence over, and colored to no small degree, the later Hebrew ; which was universal in Palestine at the time of our Lord, and which he and his disciples not only understood, but commonly employed, and which was thus the immediate groundwork and basis of much of the idiomatic Greek to be met with in the New Testament ; which the learned Jews themselves have used in writing their valuable explanations and paraphrases on the original Hebrew Scripture,—such language, it would seem, should rightly claim, by its own importance and authority, the zealous attention and study of every thoughtful Bible scholar, and especially of those who, in this learned and critical age, intend to be teachers and expounders of the Word of God.”

Tuck in his *Hand-book of Biblical Difficulties*,¹ New York, 1887, treats of difficulties relating to moral sentiments, to Eastern customs and sentiments, and to the miraculous in the Old and New Testaments. He presents five theories of inspiration and adopts an eclectic view. He quotes with approval Dr. Angus, who says : “We must not expect to learn anything from Scripture except what it is, in a religious point of view, important for us to know ;” and adds that “very much recorded in the Bible must be seen in the light of ancient sentiments and early limitations of knowledge. By the application of this principle many Bible difficulties find satisfactory solution.”

BIBLE STUDY.—The aim of the *Inductive Bible Studies* which are appearing in *The Old Testament Student* is highly to be commended, and we are glad to learn that they are meeting with general favor.²

¹ New York, 1887.

² See *The Old Testament Student* for September, New Haven, 1887.

CHAPTER IV.

OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

I. GENERAL WORKS ON INTRODUCTION.

ONE of the most interesting books that has appeared on Old Testament Introduction for a long time is a posthumous volume ¹ from the pen of Wilhelm Vatke ; and while we can only regret that he was not permitted to prepare it for the press with his own hands, and it is a work of unequal value, it is of great importance for the history of Old Testament Introduction. Vatke was remarkable not only for his native talents and scholarship, but also for the times in which he lived and his connection with Pentateuch criticism. He was a pupil of Gesenius, of Hegel, Neander, Schleiermacher, and Marheineke, and at the same time a pupil and afterwards a life-long friend of the Jewish missionary and rabbinical scholar, Dr. Biesenthal. Another friend to whom he clung until his death was David Strauss. His career began successfully. Large numbers of students attended his lectures, but Hengstenberg succeeded in keeping him in a subordinate position in the theological faculty

¹ *Wilhelm Vatke's Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament, nach Vorlesungen*, herausgegeben von Dr. Hermann G. S. Preiss, mit einem Vorwort von D. A. Hilgenfeld, Bonn, 1886.

of Berlin, and in greatly preventing his success as a lecturer.¹

The work in question is an introduction to the books of the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha. The first part treats of general introduction, the second of special. It contains the most complete and discriminating sketch of Pentateuch criticism that we have seen.²

Vatke says that Israel's history begins with the exodus from Egypt. All the rest is *sage*. He considers the narrative of the exodus and of the conquest of Canaan to a great extent legendary.³ He thinks that the commandments in a simpler form than we find them in Ex. xx, Deut. v, may perhaps be attributed to Moses.⁴ He assigns no psalms to David. The smaller part of the Psalter is preëxilic. "The authors are pious priests, prophets, and Levitical singers."⁵ "The chief age of Hebrew literature was from the eighth century to the end of the Babylonian exile. . . . The Hebrews during the course of the eighth century were drawn into complications with the greater Asiatic monarchies and into their conflict with Egypt, and thus their literature received a world-historical character."⁶

His definitions of "myth" and "*sage*" are of value on account of the frequency with which these words are used by the critics. "The criterion of the pure myth is: the experience is impossible. The contents are to be explained by the poetical form of the element of faith. To be dis-

¹ Cf. Bencke, *Wilhelm Vatke in seinem Leben und seinen Schriften*, Bonn, 1883.

² *Einleitung*, pp. 242-274.

³ *Ibid.* p. 49.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 51.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 54.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 55.

criminated from it are the mythical elements, which as views of belief are connected with facts of experience, and which transform these through a certain halo. Belonging to the Middle Ages is *saga*, which is equivalent to *sage* and myth. . . . Nitzsch says, "It is a true but not a real history."

"The case is different with *sage*. It proceeds from a real fact, or at least from the later form of it given by tradition, but connects itself in the course of time and of the tradition with mythical elements, which can in part be separated, but are in part so firmly connected with the original matter that they form one whole with it. The tradition of more remote antiquity is *sage*. History first begins with contemporaneously recorded events.

"Now, since myth and *sage* flow into each other, the mythical element is connected with the *sage*, the *sage* takes on a more ideal form through the myth; hence it is the business of science to discriminate between the two, in order on the one hand to secure the historical kernel, and on the other the view of belief at a later time. The myth is the element of belief, the *sage* the element of history." ¹

The most interesting part of this introduction is that relating to the Pentateuch.

Vatke's Religion of the Old Testament ² which appeared in 1835, the same year that Von Bohlen's Genesis ³ was published, and George's Jewish Feasts, ⁴ was an epoch-making book in the history of Pentateuch criticism. In it he showed himself a devoted disciple of Hegel and at the

¹ *Einleitung*, pp. 210, 211.

² *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, Berlin, 1835.

³ *Die Genesis historisch-kritisch erläutert*, Königsberg, 1835.

⁴ *Die älteren Jüdischen Feste, mit einer Kritik der Gesetzgebung des Pentateuch*, Berlin, 1835.

same time the forerunner of the Graf-Wellhausen school of Pentateuch criticism. Wellhausen characterizes this book as the most important contribution which was ever made to the history of Israel,¹ and gratefully acknowledges, in speaking of the priority of Deuteronomy to the Priestly Code, that he had learned the most and best from [this book of] Vatke.²

Tempora mutantur! The most extraordinary thing in Vatke's Old Testament Introduction is his abandonment of this very theory which Wellhausen has adopted. No wonder Vatke wished for the opportunity to elaborate and publish the results of his studies on the Pentateuch before his death.³ The change in his views must be considered the result of the investigations⁴ of one of the most industrious students, who retained his habits of close application and his interest in this particular subject as long as he had the power to work. His views regarding the successions of the writers, whose works the critics think they discover in the Pentateuch, are as follows:

"The second Elohist, as we shall show, was known to all the other narrators: he is therefore the oldest writer in the Pentateuch. Even the Elohim source lay before the

¹ *Geschichte Israels*, Berlin, 1878, p. 4.

² *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, Edinburgh, 1885, p. 13: "My inquiry proceeds on a broader basis than that of Graf and comes nearer to that of Vatke, from whom indeed I gratefully acknowledge to have learnt best and most."

³ *Wilhelm Vatke in seinen Leben und seinen Schriften*, Bonn, 1883. Dr. Biesenthal, one of Vatke's intimate friends, informed the writer of the change in his views.

⁴ His view of the succession of the documents in which he regarded Ex. xiii: 2-6; xix-xxiv; xxxii-xxxiv; Num. xxxiii: 50-56, and Deuteronomy, as prior to the Priests' Code, came from his construction of the History of Israel rather than from any critical analysis. Cf. Vatke, *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, Berlin, 1835, p. 429.

succeeding narrators, but not the second Elohist; the *Deuteronomiker* finally is the last chief reporter, although it may be necessary to assume additions of a lesser sort even after him.”¹

“The priestly Elohim source presupposes acquaintance with the second Elohist; on the contrary, none with the Jehovist. In Genesis this relation may appear doubtful; yet when we have carefully studied the following books of the Pentateuch, especially the second and fourth, and the Book of Joshua, we think otherwise, and then recognize in this book the use of that older writing on the part of the priestly author.”²

“The Jehovist spared the Elohim source, but restored the account of the second Elohist [which had been left out by the first Elohist], or supplemented him in his own way. It is easy to show that he knew the second Elohist: this follows from the smaller or larger insertions that he makes in the text. . . . It is also not difficult to prove that he knew the Elohim source [first Elohist], for that is shown by the connection of his account of the history of creation with that of the priestly author in Gen. ii. 4^b,”³ etc. Last of all in Vatke’s scheme comes the *Deuteronomiker*, who knew the other three writers.⁴

While the critics of Wellhausen’s school maintain the following order — 1 Jehovist, 2 second Elohist, 3 *Deuteronomiker*, 4 first Elohist — Vatke’s order is as follows: 1 second Elohist, 2 first Elohist, 3 Jehovist, *Deuterono-*

¹ *Einleitung*, p. 290.

² *Ibid.* p. 291.

³ *Ibid.* p. 294.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 95. In regard to the theories of the critics respecting the Pentateuch, see the preceding volumes of *Current Discussions in Theology*, especially Vol. i, p. 31ff.

miker. No wonder a German reviewer sees no occasion for publishing this book, which is so at war with a popular hypothesis. It is evident, however, that in Germany the last word has not been said on the succession of documents in the Pentateuch.

As an offset to Vatke's Introduction is a work by Schenz,¹ a Roman Catholic theologian, which is published under the approval of the Roman Catholic Church. It need not be said that none of the vagaries of the modern critics find any place in this book. He treats of special and general introduction, including the Apocrypha. His division of Old Testament literature into the following four periods is suggestive and interesting :

First Period (Egyptian Influence) : The Pentateuch and Joshua. *Second Period* (Phœnician Influence) : Introduction, worship, and civilization of the Phœnicians, Judges, Ruth, Kings [*i. e.*, Samuel], Psalms, Proverbs, Solomon's Song, Ecclesiastes, Job. *Third Period* (continuation of the Phœnician, accession of the Assyrio-Babylonian Influence) : I, Preëxilic Prophets : Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Isaiah ; II, Prophets during the Assyrian Exile : Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah ; III, Prophets during the Babylonian Exile : Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel. *Fourth Period* (Perso-Græco-Roman Influence) : The last two books of Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, including Esdras, Esther, Tobit, Judith, Machabees ; IV, The Prophets after the Babylonian Exile : Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jesus Sirach, the Book of Wisdom.

In dealing with each book he treats of the contents, the authenticity, the integrity, and authority. Under the

¹ *Einleitung in die Kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Regensburg, 1887.

authenticity of the Pentateuch the following quotations may give some idea of his mode of argumentation: "A reference to the Egyptian teaching regarding the gods is found in the decalogue, Ex. xx. 40: 'Thou shalt not make to thee any graven image of anything that is in heaven above (Sun=Ra), nor in the earth beneath (Isis), nor in the waters under the earth (Osiris).'

"Exodus and Leviticus particularly, in respect to liturgical arrangements, . . . are richly provided with customs borrowed from the Egyptian worship.

"The ark of the covenant is an imitation of the shrine of Ammon; the *Meïl* with the pomegranates is found on the Egyptian chief priest; the preparation of the priestly garments from linen (*byssus*); the inheriting of them, the purification of them before putting them on; the use of the urim and thummin (Coptic *thmei*), in order to learn the higher will of the gods — all these point to Egyptian usages, presuppose them as the natural basis, and on internal grounds probably make Moses, rather than Ezra, the herald of the law." ¹

His remarks regarding the age of writing, the slight difference in style of Hebrew literature for centuries, are worth attention, although the first point has been recognized by all scholars for several years.

Since the philologist, F. A. Wolf, in Halle (d. 1824), in the prolegomena to Homer (Halle, 1795), set forth the view that the Odyssey and Iliad were a conglomerate of rhapsodies by very different authors from different times, and the first, *i. e.*, the oldest literary work of the Greeks, was not written before the seventh century B.C., the critics thought that they possessed a useful weapon

¹ *Schenz, Einleitung*, p. 56.

against the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch. Meanwhile, not to speak of the monumental inscriptions, the learned Egyptologist, Seyffarth, found Egyptian papyrus rolls that dated back to 2,000 years B.C.

“Not less inapposite is the conclusion that is drawn from the slight difference in the character of the language between the Pentateuch and the writings which are notoriously later [that Moses could not have been the author of the Pentateuch]. Paul and Gregory the Great are separated by eight hundred years. Between them falls the migration of the nations, which affected in an uncommon degree the formation of the language, so that first from this time on an Italian, Spanish, and French idiom were formed from the Latin; yet the mother language did not suffer any essential change. Demosthenes and the church historian, Socrates, were separated from each other by six hundred years; nevertheless they do not begin to indicate as many linguistic differences as exist between Hans Sachs and Klopstock, who are separated by only two centuries. The Egyptologist Brugsch does not neglect to emphasize the fact that between the romance of prince ‘Setnu’ and that of the ‘Two Brothers’ a thousand years intervene, but only a slight difference can be seen in the language.”¹

II. MONOGRAPHS.

PENTATEUCH CRITICISM.—There are indications of a reaction from the views of Graf and Wellhausen, although the majority of recent critics in Germany, as we showed in the last volume, are adherents of this school. The subject has been popularized by Driver in his *Critical Notes on the*

¹ *Schenz, Einleitung*, pp. 58-59.

International Sunday-school Lessons from the Pentateuch.¹ These were originally designed for publication in the *Sunday School Times*, but after the appearance of an introductory article and four other articles, they were wisely withdrawn. Such discussions would certainly prove injurious in a popular publication like the *Times*.

Prof. Driver, however, manifests a good spirit. He says : "It is a mistake to imagine, as is sometimes done, that the critical view of the formation of the Pentateuch is framed in the interests of unbelief, or has its foundation in the premises of negative theology. . . .

"We are bound, indeed, as Christians, to accept the authority of the Old Testament, and to see in it a divine preparation for the revelation of Jesus Christ made in the Gospels; but there is no obligation upon us to accept a specific theory either of its literary structure or of the course of the history which it narrates. These may not lie upon the surface, but may have to be disengaged by the ordinary methods of human investigation and research."²

By far the most important monograph bearing on Pentateuch criticism is by Dillmann on *The Composition of the Hexateuch*.³ As the work of an unusually careful and conscientious scholar it is worthy of special study. His theory as to the four original documents united by a final editor, found in his commentary on Genesis, has already been given.⁴

In regard to the Mosaic authorship he says : "The opin-

¹ New York, 1887.

² *Ibid.* p. 7.

³ *Über die Composition des Hexateuch*, pp. 591-690, in Dillmann's *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, Leipzig, 1886.

⁴ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Vol. iii, pp. 36, 37.

ion that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch does not rest upon an authentic superscription, nor upon any other explicit testimony of the Pentateuch. For the title 'Five Books of Moses' first came into the church (especially through Rufinus and Jerome), and was never used for the Hebrew text; at least the first four books are so far from claiming to have been entirely composed by Moses, that where something written is to be referred to him, this is always expressly remarked (Ex. xvii. 14f., xxiv. 4, 7. xxxiv. 28; Num. xxxiii. 2). Only of the Deuteronomic Code (v-xxvi) does the author say that Moses wrote it (Deut. xxxi. 9, 24f., cf. xvii. 18; xxviii. 58, 61; xxix. 19f., 26; xxx. 10). After the union of Deuteronomy with the rest of the Pentateuch, the name Torah, as well as this statement, was extended to the entire book in its five parts, and the opinion was formed that Moses was author of the whole—even in Chronicles—which from that time on received almost dogmatic force.”¹

He claims, however, that the Pentateuch cannot have been written by Moses. He says: “But even the legal part of the Pentateuch cannot have been written by Moses, though it may have been orally proclaimed and written down by others. Not to speak of the fact that so extended literary activity is not admissible in the beginnings of the people of Israel, and points much rather to the time when the art of writing was widely spread abroad, there appear in the legal as well as the narrative part so many repetitions, deviations,—even in the main decalogue between Ex. xx and Deut. v,—and contradictions of the legal enactments, also so great formal and editorial differences, from the briefest and most concise form to the most dif-

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Vol. iii, p. 593.

fuse . . . that we cannot think of a uniform origin for this entire legal code.”¹

With regard to the authorship of Deuteronomy he successfully contends against the accusation, which is sometimes made, that according to the theory of the critics it must have been a “pious fraud.” He says: “We do not need to assume that Hilkiyah had anything to do with the composition of Deuteronomy. . . . Nor are we to think of Jeremiah as its author, because in spite of numerous linguistic and actual coincidences between his prophecy and Deuteronomy, the difference between them in both respects is much greater. It is much more probable that the author was one who was enthusiastic for the doctrines and principles of prophecy, perhaps he had even been a prophetic student of the law, not necessarily a priest, possibly a layman.”

He had the conviction that by means of his book he was bringing the old Mosaic laws into force again. . . . “He could not have made this claim if he had not been conscious of gathering the materials of his statutes and judgments from the oldest codices which were already considered Mosaic; and the priest Hilkiyah, who was certainly skilled in the law, would not have recognized the *Sépher hattôrâ* of Deuteronomy as a book of Moses, and would not have helped it to recognition, if he had not been of the same persuasion. We have no reason to-day to doubt his judgment and that of his contemporaries. On the contrary, where we can test his procedure by the older codices, which have been preserved to us, the conscientiousness appears with which he acted in the reproduction of the old law, and awakens a favorable judgment regarding the statutes and judgments over which we have no control.”¹

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Vol. iii, p. 595. ² *Ibid.* pp. 614, 615.

He gives the following account of the second Elohist, whom he designates by the letter B: "The most important mark of this writing is the designation of God by Elohim—even after the insertion of the Yahweh-name, Ex. iii,—which B has in common with the old historical writers in Judges and Samuel; it occurs throughout, and Yahweh is introduced into its place only through the later editor.¹ . . .

"Although we possess the book only in fragments, and also that which has been received in part only from a second hand, or worked over, yet so much is clear from the oldest *sagen-history*, onward, it gives a continuous, united, very clear, and thorough combination of that which was known or related concerning the antiquity of Israel, and its experiences until the settlement in Canaan. We cannot certainly hold that it extended farther than the history of Joshua, but it is not improbable, since as it appears the warlike history was extensively treated under the Ephraimitic hero Joshua."²

With regard to the place and time of its composition he says: "The names of the places [mentioned in it] are taken from the domain of the ten tribes. . . . We must hold that the author belonged to the kingdom of the ten tribes. . . . It must have been written before the fall of the northern kingdom, hence before the prophets Amos and Hosea.³ . . . It may be assigned to the first half of the ninth century B.C."⁴

With regard to C, or the Jehovist, he holds that it was written in the kingdom of Judah, and that it was dependent

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Vol. iii, p. 617.

² *Ibid.* p. 619.

³ *Ibid.* p. 620.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 621.

on B, the second Elohist. There were, however, other sources. He affirms that the date cannot well be placed before the middle of the eighth century.¹

Dillmann takes a much more favorable view of the priestly writer, or A, than many. He rejects the view that he deliberately invented his narrative and legislation, but finds rather that he was supported by good tradition or investigation, although he admits that he is freer in the use of his materials than the other writers.²

As to his sources, he mentions that he refers to a document, Num. xxxiii. 2, and it is inconceivable in the various genealogical, ethnographical, and geographical statements that he makes that he should not refer to written sources.³ He thinks it more likely that D was dependent on A, the first Elohist, than A, on D, and assigns the date of A to about 800 B.C.⁴

We shall not attempt to controvert Dillmann's view in the main. We simply make one criticism. Considering the fact that the country of Abraham's nativity had the art of writing, and that it was a common accomplishment among the learned Egyptians long before his time, and that the Phœnicians undoubtedly possessed the same art on account of their high standing among the Egyptians, and that the Syrian peoples possessed it from the fifteenth century B.C.,⁵ it seems to us that the critics should cease

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Vol. iii, pp. 628-630.

² *Ibid.* p. 650.

³ *Ibid.* p. 654.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 666.

⁵ Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, Stuttgart, 1884, p. 221, says: "It is certain that at this time [1500 B.C.] the Syrian stems were the intermediaries between Egypt and Babylon, and when the Papyrus Ebers, 1550 B.C., mentions a receipt for the eyes, which was composed by an Amu from Kepni . . . this shows that there was an active intellectual interchange between Syria and Egypt, in the time of the Hyksos."

to urge that on this account the Pentateuch could not have been composed in the time of Moses. It is unnecessary to suppose that the people generally could read and write, for such laws and memorials as we have in the Pentateuch were especially designed for the priests, who were the teachers of the nation.

The most surprising theory regarding Deuteronomy has recently been set forth by a French scholar, Vernes.¹ He holds, with D'Eichthal, whose views he examines, that it is made up of various documents — D'Eichthal holds that there are eight. With reference to the age Vernes considers it a post-exilic work, and that it really sustained the same relation to the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah which is commonly predicated of it in connection with the reform of Josiah.²

As the prophecy of Jeremiah exhibits a marked familiarity with Deuteronomy it is necessary that Vernes should adopt the bold hypothesis that it is a pseudepigraph, assigned to Jeremiah, as Deuteronomy is assigned to Moses.³ He holds that the Priests' Code was composed in the fourth century B.C., and that the final redaction of the Hexateuch occurred in the third century B.C.⁴ Horst, a German critic, who reviews this little book,⁵ considers it a witness of the great uncertainty even of those results of Old Testament criticism which are now considered best established. It seems to us rather a witness to the fool-hardy lengths to which an unbridled criticism can go.

¹ *Une Nouvelle Hypothèse sur la Composition et l'Origine du Deutéronome, examen des vues de M. G. D'Eichthal*, Paris, 1887.

² *Ibid.* p. 23.

³ *Ibid.* p. 41.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 51.

⁵ Cf. *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, 1887, pp. 393-396.

It is certainly interesting to observe in conclusion that two such scholars as Dillmann and Vatke agree in assigning the Priests' Code to a date long before the Exile.

THE WISDOM LITERATURE.—Cheyne has written a book on Job and Solomon¹ which unites the charm of a modest personality with profound scholarship. His work really treats of the various critical questions which are raised in the study of Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. As is well known, Cheyne is a free critic, but he is a reverent one, and does not rush into each of the newest hypotheses of the critics with that intemperate zeal which characterizes so many minds.

In the introduction he raises the question: "How is Old Testament criticism related to Christianity?" He emphasizes the redemptive element in Israel's history—"namely, that a holy God, for the good of the world, chose out this people [Israel], isolating it more and more completely for educational purposes from its heathen neighbors, and interposing at various times to teach, to chastise, and to deliver it! It is not necessary to prove that all such recorded interpositions are in the strictest sense historical; it is enough if the tradition or the record of some that are so did survive the great literary as well as political catastrophe of the Babylonian captivity. We have yet to learn that the Exodus, the destruction of Sennacherib's army, the restoration of the Jews to their own land, and the unique phenomenon of spiritual prophecy, are called in question by the most advanced school of Biblical criticism."²

¹ *Job and Solomon, or the Wisdom of the Old Testament*, London, 1887.

² *Ibid.* pp. 2-3.

He thinks that the truth regarding the origin of the Pentateuch lies between the two extremes, and contended "that if either exegesis or the church's representation of religious truth is to make any decided progress, the results of the literary analysis of the Pentateuch must be accepted as facts, and that theologians must in future recognize at least three different sections, and as many different conceptions of Israel's religious development within the Pentateuch."¹

JOB.—Cheyne says of the Book of Job: "I would entitle it THE BOOK OF THE TRIAL OF THE RIGHTEOUS MAN, AND OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF GOD."

With respect to the date of the book he rejects the theory that it belongs to the age of Moses or even to that of Solomon. He thinks that it cannot be assigned to a period earlier than Isaiah and Jeremiah,² and recognizes in "the description of the Chaldeans as *robbers* a covert allusion to the invasions of Nebuchadnezzar," hence he thinks "a later date than the Exile-period is not . . . inconceivable." He considers the question as to the place where the book was prepared "well-nigh an idle one . . . of far less importance than the time when it was composed." He finally determines the date by arguments taken from the internal testimony of the book: (1) "from the use of mythology;" (2) "from the doctrine of angels;" (3) "from parallel passages." From these combined arguments he concludes that the Book of Job is not earlier than the Exile,³ and he thinks

¹ *Job and Solomon, or the Wisdom of the Old Testament*, p. 5.

² *Ibid.* pp. 72-74.

³ *Ibid.* p. 78.

that "the speeches at any rate [were written] during the Exile."¹

With regard to the book itself he raises the question: "Is Job a Hebraco-Arabic poem?" and says, "That the Book of Job is not as deeply penetrated with the spirit of revelation, nor even as distinctly Israelitish a production, as most of the Old Testament writings, requires no argument. May we venture to go further, and infer from various phenomena that, not merely the artistic form of the *māshāl*, but the thoughts and even the language of *Job* came in a greater or less degree from a foreign source?" Cheyne thinks we may venture to reply in the affirmative, on two grounds: (1) the ideas, to which he assigns less importance, but which he finds similar to those appearing among the Arabs, especially in the doctrine of retribution; (2) from "the Arabisms and Aramaisms of the language of Job." This point, however, he makes with caution. He conjectures that "the poem of Job is a grand attempt to renovate and enrich the Hebrew language."² He calls especial attention to the Arabian color of the poem in its sketches of animals, of astronomy deepened by the spectacle of a night-sky in Arabia,³ etc.

With regard to "the book from a religious point of view" he says: "The hero of the poem . . . is, not indeed a type, but in some sense prophetic of the Christ, inasmuch as the very conception of a righteous man enduring vast calamities, not so much for his own sake as for the world's, is a bold hypothesis which could only in the Christ be made good. . . . Job is not indeed a Saviour, but the im-

¹ *Job and Solomon, or the Wisdom of the Old Testament*, p. 88.

² *Ibid.* pp. 98, 99.

³ *Ibid.* p. 100.

agination of such a figure prepares the way for a Saviour.”¹ Hence he claims that one of “the grandest elements in the Book of Job which helped to prepare the noblest minds among the Jews for the reception of primitive Christianity [was] the idea of a righteous man suffering simply because it pleased Jehovah to bruise him.” Another element which he discovers is the idea of a supra-mundane justice, which will one day manifest itself in favor of the righteous sufferer, not only in this world (xvi. 18, 19, xix. 25, xlii) so that all men may recognize their innocence, but also beyond the grave, the sufferers themselves being in some undefined manner brought back to life in the conscious enjoyment of God’s favor (xiv. 13-15, xix. 26, 27).²

PROVERBS.—Under the Book of Proverbs, Cheyne discusses more specifically the nature of the wisdom-literature of which the Book of Job furnishes an important part, although not the best example. In response to the inquiry: “What is this Hebrew wisdom?” he replies: “First of all, it is the link between the more exceptional revelations of Old Testament prophecy and the best moral and intellectual attainments of other nations than the Jews.”

He gives the three technical names for the varieties of proverbs: (1) “*māshāl*, a short, pointed saying with reference to some striking feature in the life of an individual, or in human life generally, often clothed in figurative language (2) *m’lîṣa*, perhaps a ‘bent,’ ‘oblique’ or ‘dark’ saying, (3) *khîḏa*, a ‘knotty’ or intricate saying, especially a riddle.”³

¹ *Job and Solomon, or the Wisdom of the Old Testament*, p. 103.

² *Ibid.* pp. 103, 104.

³ *Ibid.* p. 125.

With regard to the authorship of this book he rejects Solomon. He affirms: "The name of Solomon was attached (for dogmatism here seems permissible) to these choice specimens of Hebrew proverbiality simply from a very characteristic hero-worship. Solomon had in fact become the symbol of plain ethical 'wisdom' just as David had become the representative of religious lyric poetry. We may see this . . . from the fiction of Solomon's authorship of Ecclesiastes, and from the Targumic paraphrase of Jer. ix. 23, 'Let not *Solomon the son of David*, the wise man, glory in his wisdom.'"

He, however, is inclined to admit "a far-off 'influence of the Solomonic age,'" and he thinks that the fact that the second collection of so-called Solomonic proverbs was compiled according to a credible tradition (xxv. 1) in the reign of Hezekiah, throws the earlier collection a considerable way back into the eighth century.²

He thinks chapters i-ix may have been written toward the close of the kingdom of Judah,³ and agrees with "most critics" that the collection in x. 1-xxii. 16 is the earliest part of the book.⁴

His interesting discussion of *The Book of Koheleth, or Ecclesiastes*, we must omit for want of space.

Hermann Deutsch has written a valuable pamphlet on *The Proverbs of Solomon according to the Interpretation in*

¹ *Job and Solomon, or the Wisdom of the Old Testament*, London, 1887, p. 165. Cheyne says: "I doubt not that many bright and witty sayings of Solomon came into circulation, and some of them might conceivably be gathered up and included in the anthologies"

² *Ibid.* p. 142.

³ *Ibid.* p. 168.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 169.

*the Talmud and Midrash.*¹ He discusses the question of the Solomonic authorship of the entire book, and mentions the difficulties that some of the writers in the Midrash indicate respecting the question. Some of them say that "he composed those elevated moral sentiments in his youth, when his heart was still entirely turned to his heavenly Father."² Deutsch, however, holds that Solomon was the author of x-xxii. 17; xxv-xxx. 1, but he considers that i-x. 1 was composed during a period of luxury and social corruption such as is described in the prophets.³

He makes a brief although interesting contribution to the problem of text criticism from the side of the Talmud. He speaks of numerous passages in which the Rabbins emphasize and explain the various readings in such a way that even the Tosaphists said: ⁴ "The Rabbins must often have had other readings deviating from our Massoretic text," although in another place they express the conjecture that many of these variants may be only apparent, and have arisen from the favorite mode of citing verses more according to the contents than the verbal form.⁵

THE PSALMS.—Prof. C. H. Toy of the Divinity School at Harvard University belongs, as is well known, to the

¹ *Die Sprüche Salomo's nach der Auffassung im Talmud und Midrash dargestellt und kritisch untersucht*, Berlin, 1885.

² *Ibid.* p. 26.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 29, 30.

⁴ The Tosaphists are disciples of Rashi (d. 1105), a Jewish commentator on the Old Testament and on the Talmud. They added supplementary glosses to his comments on the latter work. Cf. McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, New York, 1881, Vol. x, pp. 498, 499, and Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, Berlin, 1845.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 64.

modern critical school, and is one of its ablest exponents in America. He has recently written "On the Asaph-Psalms,"¹ and "On Maccabæan Psalms."² He affirms that his critical conclusions, reached independently, agree in the main with those of Justus Olshausen³ and Edward Reuss.⁴ He holds with the former, that the Maccabæan period was eminently fitted to produce a psalm literature. "It was a time which stirred the feeling of the nation to its depths; which called forth its highest energies, and aroused it to a pitch of intense enthusiasm." He thinks, however, we may search the whole period from the eleventh century B.C. . . . for the authorship of the Psalms. He considers the following on internal grounds as belonging to the Maccabæan periods: xliv, lxxiv, lxxix, lxxxiii, lxxxvii.⁵

ISAIAH.—Prof. Guthe of Leipzig discusses a new phase of prophecy, especially Isaianic prophecy.⁶ He says that "the attention of theologians has been too exclusively directed to those expressions of the prophet which were referred to the person of Jesus, to the neglect of his other addresses, which were of preëminent importance for the historical understanding of his activity."⁷

Guthe's object is to show how Isaiah's prophecies contain

¹ *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, Boston, 1886, pp. 73-85.

² *Unitarian Review*, Vol. xxvi, Boston, 1886.

³ *Die Psalmen*, Leipzig, 1853, p. 7ff.

⁴ *Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, Braunschweig, 1881, p. 587.

⁵ See the writer's article in the *Expositor on Recent Old Testament Studies in America*.

⁶ *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaja*, Leipzig, 1885.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 2.

two pictures of the future which grow up out of the historical circumstances of the time.

His first picture of the future is of the Messiah, a son of David, who is called to found an ideal kingdom of God in Israel.¹ He represents him as learning the religious virtues of confidence in God through privation and want. "He grows up in a depopulated, wasted, and wilderness land that does not afford any other nourishment than milk and honey. . . . This circumstance of the waste condition of his native land is to be an important means of giving his mind the necessary training for his calling. . . . Without it he will not receive the knowledge of God which fits him for it. . . . Further, Isaiah evidently combines with the description of the future rule of the son of David the presupposition that room will be made for him through the overthrow of the present ruling member of the house of David."

"These events, which indicate a complete dissolution and annihilation of Israel and Judah, form the dark background without which the first future image of Isaiah cannot be conceived."²

Guthe then sketches the second picture of the future, which affords a striking contrast to it, if it is not contradictory. From 724 B.C. on, when Judah begins to be released from the fear of Assyria, the prophecies take on a new character. Isaiah prophesies the success of Judah against their enemies, and in the twenty-four years says nothing more about the son of David. "The foundation thought of these discourses respecting the future of Judah is: 'Zion (or Jerusalem) will not be conquered by the Assyrians.'

¹ *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia*, Leipzig, 1885, p. 7.

² *Ibid.* p. 11.

This forms the characteristic peculiarity of the second image of the future of the Messiah."

Guthe, however, connects these two pictures. He says: "The difference between these two pictures of the future comes clearly to view. The one contains presuppositions that exclude the other. The future son of David finds no place in the rescued city of Jerusalem, which after the danger of siege conceals the same king as before, in its walls. In spite of this difference the connection of the two pictures cannot be overlooked. The hope is common to both that the punishment of the divine anger will still leave a remnant out of which the new Israel will be developed. Who this remnant is to be, and how it is to be reëstablished or sustained, does not appear from the first picture of the future. For this reason this remnant stands all the more in the foreground of the second picture."

Whether this view of Guthe's is correct or not as to the occasion of these different views of the future,¹ it seems to us that he loses the spiritual conception of these prophecies by fixing his attention too exclusively on the drapery of the truths which they present.

JOEL. — A young American scholar,² in a dissertation, presented to obtain the degree of Ph.D., has subjected the Book of Joel to a critical examination. He holds that Joel wrote before the Exile, and that the Pentateuchal question should have nothing to do in determining the date.³ He

¹ Kamphausen, a critic of the liberal school, takes decided exceptions to the exegesis of some of the passages on which Guthe bases his theory.

² Pearson, *The Prophecy of Joel: Its Unity, its Aim and the Age of its Composition*, Leipzig, 1885.

³ *Ibid.* p. 114.

thinks that the date of this prophecy most probably fell in one of the years following Shishak's invasion and seizure of Jerusalem, which occurred about 970 B.C.¹ It seems to us doubtful whether the time when this prophecy was written can ever be satisfactorily determined, as the question of the date turns so much on rather indefinite internal evidence.

¹ Pearson, *The Prophecy of Joel: Its Unity, its Aim and the Age of its Composition*, Leipzig, 1885, p. 153.

CHAPTER V.

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

GENERAL WORKS.—The contributions to Old Testament history during the past two years have been of an important character. Stade has continued his work, noticed in a previous volume,¹ to the fall of the Judæan state, while books on the great world empires, with which Israel came in contact, are embodying the most important researches in Egyptology and Assyriology.

The critical mode of viewing Israel's history is set forth by a Dutch pastor,² Dr. Gunning, whose commentary on Amos has already come before us. As a popular and correct statement of the principles of the critical method in dealing with the history of God's ancient people it is of value.

He distinguishes between the use of the Old Testament for purposes of edification by the common Christian, without reference to the time and circumstances under which various accounts were written, and a critical survey of the history.

In constructing the history he maintains that the documents should be subjected to the same tests as those of

¹ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1884, Vol. ii, p. 33f.

² *De kritische Beschouwing van Israëls Geschiedenis*, Haarlem, 1885.

profane history. Indeed, he considers the childhood of Israel's history as affording the same phenomena as that of any other people. He holds that the reminiscences of these child days before the time of Moses, when the history of Israel properly begins, are indistinct and untrustworthy for the purposes of exact history. And yet he says: "We believe from the heart in the special revelation of God to Israel, and therefore we firmly believe that at the beginning of this history, on which so much depended for later times, the divine leading was tenderly active."¹ Hence, while Theseus and Cadmus, Romulus and Remus, are mythical to him, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in their *ensemble*, in the kernel of their history, are historical, although their persons have become surrounded with a legendary halo of glory. He does not seem, however, to regard them as historical personages. He says: "The three patriarchs in the fullest sense of the word are types of Israel; in each of them a certain side of the Hebrew spirit finds expression. Abraham is 'probably the most ideal figure of the three.'"²

He formulates the proper method of constructing Israel's history as follows: "The critical view of Israel's history is that which treats the sources from which this history must be drawn according to the methods which are customary in treating every other history, and thus an investigation is instituted into the origin, antiquity, and credibility of the Old Testament sources."³

He believes that the same difficulties beset the investigation of the Old Testament sources, as the investigation

¹ *De kritische Beschouwing van Israëls Geschiedenis*, Haarlem, 1885, p. 18.

² *Ibid.* p. 19. While we admit the typical character of the three patriarchs we firmly hold that they were progenitors of the Israelitish people.

³ *Ibid.* p. 21.

of other memorials of antiquity. He says: "All antiquity, and especially Semitic antiquity, was a stranger to the thirst for objective naked facts, which is so much a characteristic of our times. Hence, almost all the Old Testament books, even the historical, are tendency-writings (*tendenz-geschriften*), *i. e.*, their object is not to give mere facts, but instruction, warning, and exhortation."¹ We might add in other words that Old Testament history subserves a homiletical purpose.

Another difficulty which he claims that the critic finds is in the alleged pseudepigraphic character of some of the sources. He speaks of this as an undeniable fact, which was characteristic of all antiquity, Greek, Roman, Arabian, and Persian. All these "possessed a literature of which a considerable part was pseudepigraphic, *i. e.* where all sorts of books were written under names of persons who never wrote them and never could have written them."²

¹ *De kritische Beschouwing van Israëls Geschiedenis*, Haarlem, 1885, p. 25.

² While Dr. Gunning seems to occupy such a free position with regard to critical questions, he seems to be conservative in his theological views. We give some of the points which serve to explain the unique position of such a man:

1. "We recognize and will recognize that in the application of this criticism we lose much. . . . We must not flatter ourselves with the thought that in spite of these premises all will remain as it was. No; the whole course of Israel's history is changed. . . .

2. "We cannot be careful and reverential enough in entering on this work. . . . As studious and reflecting men we can no longer turn from this criticism, but are to examine it earnestly; and although it costs us much to recognize its rights, if it clearly appears to us to be an honorable investigation. But the many hypotheses of the critics, their frequent open dislike for miracles, and the revelation of God, . . . their arbitrariness in too many ways with the sacred pages of Scripture, and their dividing it up into splinters, serves to warn us to use great care. . . .

3. "We must place our criticism earnestly and constantly under the control

Although Gunning is to be commended for what he holds, and his position is interesting as illustrating loyalty to the Scriptures even where the theories of the modern critics are embraced, yet the Old Testament history seems to be different from profane history in this respect, that its entire course is conditioned by the singling out of one family as the source from which the people of redemption was to come. There is certainly nothing incredible in the supposition that such a fact would be easily preserved as a sacred tradition for centuries, and that it would never be forgotten that God called Abraham, and made a covenant with him.

The most important contribution to Old Testament history¹ has been furnished by Stade, Professor of Old Testa-

of faith in the Christ of Scripture, the Incarnate Word. This is the center-point, which is immovable. It is thus that we are distinguished principally from the modern critical school, from whom we gratefully recognize that we have received almost all our light in these matters. And we are persuaded that we are ready at all times to receive from the modern school the accusation of half-heartedness (*'half-heid'*), and from our orthodox brethren that of unbelief. . . .

4. "We will remind our orthodox brethren with all emphasis, whenever they wish to discuss the question, that they exercise criticism as well as we. . . . The Canon itself is nothing else than the result of criticism.

5. "We do not forget that this criticism has nothing in common with the preaching of the gospel. . . . Our glorious work is only to preach positively the faith of the church, to know nothing in its midst, but Jesus Christ and him crucified. To this faith of the church does not belong a clear insight into the scientific infallibility of the Holy Scriptures. The Scriptures are infallible as a means of grace for our poor souls, infallible therefore in their working for the salvation of each sinner; hence they are infallible as the rule of faith." *De kritische Beschouwing van Israëls Geschiedenis*, Haarlem, 1885, pp. 60-63.

¹This work is appearing in Oncken, *Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen*, under the title *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Berlin, Heft i, ii, 1881, Heft iii, 1884, Heft iv, 1885, Heft v, 1886.

ment Theology at Giessen, who seems to belong, with Schürer, Harnack, and others, to the school of Ritschl. In his critical views of the Old Testament he is essentially an adherent of the school of Graf-Wellhausen.

He maintains that the history of Israel is rather the history of the religion of Israel than of the people of Israel. This has controlled the use of documents and the form of the history.

There are two views of the religion of Israel as found in the Bible: 1. That in it we have the record of a divine revelation to God's ancient people, adjusted to human needs and limited by the ignorance and barbarism of early times; 2. That it is the record of a purely natural development from fetichism before the time of Moses, up through polytheism and monolotry to a pure monotheism in the time of the prophets. There is this radical difference in these conceptions of the history, that on the one hand God is recognized as a supernatural power appearing for the help of his people at the crises of their history, and speaking through his servants the messages that they need, while on the other everything is believed to proceed according to the ordinary laws of human thought and progress. According to the one Israel's history is unique, since it is the history of God's peculiar people—the people of redemption; according to the other it follows the analogy of the history of other peoples in its origin and the course of its development. In the one case we have supernaturalism working to produce a certain effect; in the other we have pure naturalism.

We must, however, agree with the critics of the modern historico-critical school in submitting the records of Israel's history to the severest critical tests. Whatever may be our theories of the inspiration of the Old Testament, we

must lay them entirely aside in the treatment of this subject, or not enter upon it at all. It is useless to take merely a partisan view of the subject, and think we can render any substantial service to the cause of truth by ignoring or belittling any facts which are not favorable to our theories. In sacred as well as profane history we are concerned to get at the truth.

What, then, is the modern critic's view of the history of Israel as represented by Stade in the work before us?

We have space for the consideration of only two points :
1. It is impossible that the religion of Israel should have been produced all at once as a completed whole, like Christianity or Mohammedanism.

While Stade admits that Christianity began full-fledged, he claims that the Israelitish religion must have been developed gradually. It can be proved that essential Christianity is found in the person of Christ, who did not write a line that has come down to us, and in the writings of Paul. For this Christianity there was indeed a broad foundation in the Old Testament, but after all dead Judaism was as unlike spiritual Christianity as the dry cocoon is unlike the gorgeous butterfly. Christianity began with a miracle — the resurrection of Christ, which was the center of Paul's teaching and writing.

Now if we cut away the root of the patriarchal history, as Stade and the other modern critics do, we lack the basis of Mosaism as a completed system ; but if we take the patriarchal history of the Pentateuch as it stands, we have a basis for the spiritual side of Mosaism, and in the connection of Israel and their leader with Egypt we have a further basis for the legal and ritualistic side of Mosaism.

Israel was born when it crossed the Red Sea, through a miracle. Its laws have their inception in the personality

of Moses, and the needs of the people, especially as foreseen in their settlement in Canaan, but were divinely communicated. There seems to be no reason then for questioning that Mosaism in its essential elements was as truly a finished creation from the hands of Moses as Christianity was from the hands of Christ, and his servant the apostle Paul.

2. Stade holds that an examination of Israelitish documents gives evidence of development from fetichism to monotheism. Stade thinks he finds many traces of animism and fetichism in the Old Testament, and quotes with approval the theories of Tylor as developed in his *Primitive Culture*. These he applies to the Old Testament with W. Robertson Smith.¹ He rejects the origin of tribes as given in the Old Testament, since he says that no people knows its own progenitor. He thinks that the Israelitish tribes, which were not twelve in number, arose through fusion after the analogy of the Arabs and other nomad peoples.

Animism is really a kind of spiritism, a belief that the spirits of ancestors and others continue to exist after death. This belief has come from ghostly visions of relatives and friends after death. The survivor may connect these spirits with a charm, a tree, a stone, or an animal. It is in this way that totemism arises, and that certain tribes even in Israelitish history are named after animals.² Hence, Stade finds among the Hebrews animism and fetichism in the form of the worship of ancestors. This appears from the language which is used of burial, as being gathered to the fathers, and in the doctrine concerning sheol. The second stage, although not necessarily second in time, is polytheism. The third is monolotry, or the worship of Jehovah

¹ Cf. *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, Cambridge, 1885, p. 217f.

² *Ibid.* p. 186ff.

merely as the God of Israel. That this existed appears from the expressions of David and others who regarded banishment from the land of Israel as banishment from the God of Israel. Monotheism, which regards Jehovah as the only God of all the earth, is the final stage in the development, and is the creation of prophecy.

It is not necessary for us to try to disprove the existence of either of these features of superstition in Israel. It is the testimony of Scripture itself that the progenitors of the Israelites in Chaldæa were idolaters, that idolatry was found in the family of Jacob, possibly in the form of fetichism, that Israel in Egypt fell into idolatry; and we know that until after the Exile there was scarcely ever a period in their history when we do not find evidence of superstition and the worship of false gods. There are, then, clear evidences of polytheism through most of the periods of Israel's history to the time of the Exile. Should it be established that traces of fetichism are found among them and that the Old Testament saints did not have clear conceptions of Jehovah as the God of all the earth at every stage of the history, these things would not prove that there was a development from fetichism to monotheism; they would not disprove that a pure monotheism was revealed to Moses which he taught to the people. The history of missions ancient and modern demonstrates how a pure faith has to struggle for centuries with pagan superstitions, sometimes, as in the case of the Romish Church, in vain.

We do not deny the difficulty of the problems presented by modern criticism in the construction of the history of Israel, but it seems to us that on the principle that for every effect there must be an adequate cause, the course of that history cannot be explained on the principles of naturalistic development, but rather on the principle of progress

in the acceptance of a revelation made by the hand of Moses, as well as in subsequent revelations which came to the people through the prophets.¹

Neither the work of a French rabbi, Emile Lévy,² nor of the Roman Catholic Kohlbauer,³ are of any value to us in meeting the arguments of the critics or in giving us a scientific view of the history of Israel.

II. MONOGRAPHS AND ANCIENT HISTORIES.

A book by Rabbi Rosenzweig, judged by its title, "The Century after the Babylonian Exile, with especial reference to the religious development of Judaism,"⁴ indicates a very interesting and difficult theme on which information is especially desired. The work, however, seems to be entirely uncritical and almost useless.

Howard, a German pastor, has written a book entitled "Contributions to an Agreement between Old Testament historical narrative, chronology, and prophecy on the one hand, and Assyrian, together with Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions, on the other."⁵ The subject of Biblical chronology, as we have already intimated in a previous volume, is difficult,⁶ and careful investigation is greatly needed on this

¹ For a more complete discussion of this entire subject see the writer's article on *The History of Israel from the Stand-point of Modern Criticism*, in the *Expositor*, London and New York, 1887, pp. 321-339.

² *La Monarchie chez Les Juifs en Palestine selon La Bible et Le Talmud*, Paris, 1885.

³ *Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Bundesvolkes*, Regensburg, 1886.

⁴ *Das Jahrhundert nach dem babylonischen Exile mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die religiöse Entwicklung des Judenthums*, Berlin, 1885.

⁵ *Beiträge zum Ausgleich zwischen alttestamentlicher Geschichtserzählung, Zeitrechnung und Prophetie einerseits und assyrischen nebst babylonischen keilinschriften andererseits*, Gotha, 1887.

⁶ *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1884, Vol. ii, p. 49f.

subject. The aim of the author, however, as he states in his preface, is an apologetic one. He says he does not wish to have the title understood as if there were to be a compromise between the Bible and Assyriology, because the truth lies between the two; but he says that its essential aim is a defense of the Holy Scriptures; its contents belong to apologetics. It seems to us, however, that this investigation does not belong at all to the department of apologetics, but to that of exact historical criticism. The question is simply one of facts. We shall certainly rejoice to have the Biblical chronology confirmed, but any confirmation which does not rest on a historical basis is worthless.

The Patriarchal Times,¹ by Dr. Whitelaw, devotes nine chapters to such subjects as "the creation of the world, the appearing of man, the cradle of the race, the story of the fall, the first age of history, the judgment of the flood, the second age of history, the table of nations, the tower of Babel." The remaining three chapters are on "the call and the pilgrimage of Abraham." The book is written from a conservative stand-point and contains much useful information.

Echoes of Bible History,² by Bishop Walsh, covers a wider range, and is an excellent book for pastors who have not time to consult more extended works. He is in general careful and conservative in his use of the monuments, but in one case quotes an Assyrian text where the allusion, which some scholars discover, to Sodom and Gomorrah is doubtful.³ He says: "The elevation of a stranger like Joseph to the high position of being Grand Vizier of the realm is more easily accounted for if the ruling dynasty

¹ London, 1887.

² New York, 1887.

³ *Echoes of Bible History*, p. 107.

was itself a foreign one, and especially if it was that of the shepherd kings.”¹ He makes an interesting suggestion about the possible connection of the monotheism of the patriarchs with that of Apepi, who according to tradition was the king under whom Joseph came to power. He says that “Apepi . . . made a proclamation that one god only — namely, Set or Sutech — was to be worshiped throughout his dominions. . . . Possibly the monotheism of this race of the shepherd kings was another link of sympathy between Apepi and the family of Jacob.”²

Abraham, his Life and Times, by Deane, and *Moses, his Life and Times*,³ by Prof. Rawlinson, belong to a series published both in England and America, which also includes Gideon, Elijah, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Jesus Christ. They contain information that is of value to every student of the Bible, especially to those who do not have access to larger works. Rawlinson accepts Dean Payne Smith’s view that the household of the patriarchs numbered three thousand souls; he thinks that Abraham’s family must have exceeded twelve hundred persons. In this way the rapid increase of the Israelites may be more easily accounted for. With regard to Moses’ education he says, as all “educated Romans in the days of Cicero learned Greek, and all Russians in the time of Alexander I were taught French, so in the days of Moses all educated Egyptians had to be familiar with a Semitic dialect, which if not exactly Hebrew was at any rate closely akin to it.”⁴ He compares the emigration of 2,000,000 of Israelites to that of 40,000 Tartars in recent times.⁵

¹ *Echoes of Bible History*, p. 150.

² *Ibid.* p. 152.

³ London and New York, 1887.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 31.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 120.

EGYPTIAN HISTORY.—At least three series of ancient histories are now being published, two in Germany¹ and one in America.² An excellent history of Egypt has appeared from the pen of Weidmann.³ He denies with some of the best authorities that there is any connection between the Hebrews and the Aperiū.⁴ While “the monuments naturally give no information concerning Moses,” he considers “their statements of great interest for the proper understanding of the Mosaic legislation, since it can be proved that many things in them have been derived from Egypt, especially in the external matters of worship and in the entire ceremonial.” Such a relation between the religious systems cannot be established. He says that “the monotheistic idea which forms the basis of his entire system cannot be proved to have existed in Egypt.”⁵

The history of Egypt in Oncken's series is by Edward Meyer,⁶ who evidently adopts the positions of the modern critics regarding the Old Testament history. He holds, however, with Weidmann that *ápru* (he says the vowels are uncertain) does not indicate the Hebrews, but simply workmen, in one case ship-builders and sailors, in the other those who were engaged in breaking and polishing stone.

Of all these books on Egypt, the best for the study of

¹ We refer to the series published by Perthes of Gotha, and also to that of Oncken.

² Putnam's Series, *The Story of the Nations*, is of a more popular character.

³ *Ägyptische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1884.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 491.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 492.

⁶ *Geschichte des alten Ägyptens*, Berlin, Heft 1, 1886, Heft 2, 1887. Besides this there has already appeared, Dümichen, *Einleitung: Geographie des alten Ägyptens, Schrift und Sprache seiner Bewohner*, Berlin, 1880-1882.

the Old Testament is Prof. Rawlinson's *Story of Ancient Egypt*.¹

Two books remain on Egypt, one which really belongs to the department of homiletics, *The Pharaohs of the Bondage and the Exodus*, by Dr. Robinson, which contains information rendering it useful to the general reader;² and a series of lectures entitled *Abraham, Joseph, and Moses in Egypt*, delivered by Rev. A. H. Kellogg, D.D., of Philadelphia, before the students of Princeton Theological Seminary.³ While this book exhibits much learning, the author has built too much on the early Hebrew chronology, which is at best uncertain. Rejecting the regnant theory that Menepthah was the Pharaoh of the Exodus, he holds that it was Siptah, a later king. The book seems rather disappointing.

"The Egyptian Exploration Fund" is still excavating "in Egypt with a view to the elucidation of the History and Arts of Ancient Egypt, and the illustration of the Old Testament narrative so far as it has to do with Egypt and the Egyptians."⁴

CHALDÆA AND ANCIENT ASSYRIA. A gifted Russian lady, Madam Z. A. Ragozin, has prepared a volume on Chaldæa⁵ and also one on Assyria.⁶ These volumes fur-

¹ New York, 1887.

² New York, 1887.

³ New York, 1887.

⁴ Cf. *Rules of the Egypt Exploration Fund, and Report of the Fourth Annual General Meeting*, London, 1885, 1886.

⁵ *The Story of Chaldæa from the Earliest Times to the Rise of Assyria, Treated as a General Introduction to the Study of Ancient History*, New York, 1886.

⁶ *The Story of Assyria from the Rise of the Empire to the Fall of Nineveh*, New York, 1887.

nish a full list of the latest books on the subjects of which they treat, and without indorsing all the views or tendencies presented in them, we warmly commend them as likely to be useful to ministers and theological students, not to speak of the general reader. Tiele is preparing an admirable volume on Babylonio-Assyrian history¹ in Perthes' series of "Hand-books of Ancient History."

Hommel in his history of Babylonio-Assyria² unfolds the importance of the study of this history for the Old Testament student of prophecy. He says that the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, which has been considered by modern investigators as a late interpolation from the time of the Exile, has been proved by old Babylonian inscriptions to be the oldest historical account in the Old Testament.³ He also maintains, contrary to the common view, that Babylonian civilization is prior to that of Egypt.

¹ *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte, I, Teil; von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Tode Sargons II*, Gotha, 1886.

² *Geschichte Babyloniens-Assyriens*, Berlin, Heft 1, 1885, Heft 2, 1886, Heft 3, 1887.

³ Cf. Ewald's view, *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1884, Vol. ii, pp. 34, 35; Hommel, *Ibid.* p. 11.

CHAPTER VI.

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

Prof. Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, has produced a marked book on Messianic Prophecy,¹ which is an honor to American Old Testament scholarship. As is well known, Dr. Briggs is a champion of perfect freedom in matters of Old Testament criticism. While sympathizing with W. Robertson Smith and the modern critical school, he would be considered in Germany as belonging to that wing of Old Testament theologians who are commonly called conservative. The volume which has already appeared is the first of a series. Whatever may be the critical stand-point of the reader, all must hope that the author may be spared to complete the series.

He says that Messianic prophecy has been too much dominated by apologetic and polemical interests, and the historical and dogmatic bearings of the theme have been too much neglected.² He claims that according to the representation of the Old Testament Scriptures, genuine prophecy is found beyond the range of the chosen people. Thus the nations of the world were prepared for the higher religion when it should come to them.³ He says: "With-

¹ *Messianic Prophecy; The Prediction of the Fulfilment of Redemption through the Messiah; A Critical Study of the Messianic Passages of the Old Testament in the Order of their Development*, New York, 1886.

² *Ibid.* p. 7.

³ *Ibid.* p. 4.

out denying to other religions an occasional divine influence in their prophecy, springing from the ordinary working of the divine providence in the affairs of mankind, without excluding altogether the prophecy of the great religions of the earth from occasional extraordinary divine influences, such as are called supernatural, we claim that these extraordinary divine influences give Hebrew prophecy its characteristic features.”¹

“Hebrew prophecy combines in a remarkable manner the real and the ideal. If the real is in exact conformity to truth, still more is the ideal a mirror of the divine mind. The ideal of Hebrew prophecy is the regulative factor of the entire Old Testament covenant.² . . . The doctrine of redemption given by the Hebrew prophets is a divine idea, and cannot be explained as an evolution of human hopes and fears and aspirations.”³

“Hebrew prophecy is adapted to the practical issues of life, to the needs of the day, and the person and the affair. Hence we must eliminate the circumstantial and the variable from the essential and permanent in these departments.”⁴

“Prediction is [a] comparatively small section of Hebrew prophecy. . . . Prediction is the instruction that prophecy gives as it looks forth from the present into the future.⁵ . . . From its very nature [it] presents the future in the forms of the present and the past. These forms are not real and

¹ *Messianic Prophecy ; The Prediction of the Fulfilment of Redemption through the Messiah ; A Critical Study of the Messianic Passages of the Old Testament in the Order of their Development*, New York, 1886, p. 19.

² *Ibid.* p. 28.

³ *Ibid.* p. 31.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 31.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 35.

literal representations of the future, but ideal and symbolical." ¹

"The scholastic theory of prophecy . . . sought above all verbal accuracy and circumstantial and detailed fulfilment. It sought by strained interpretations to identify prophecy and history. . . . The purely formal elements belong to the point of view and coloring of the individual prophets. We are not to find exact and literal fulfilments in details, or in general, but the fulfilment is limited to the essential ideal contents of the prophecy." ²

"The prophets are human beings ; and although they become the instruments of conveying divine ideas to their fellow-men, yet these divine ideas assume the forms and clothing of the human medium through which they pass." ³

"It is a law of predictive prophecy that the prophets foresee the final goal to which the movements of their time are tending, and to which they will inevitably reach. . . . The ringing lesson of all predictive prophecy is : Be patient in suffering, for redemption is surely coming — we know not how quickly. Repent immediately, for the day of judgment may come at any moment." ⁴

¹ *Messianic Prophecy ; The Prediction of the Fulfilment of Redemption through the Messiah ; A Critical Study of the Messianic Passages of the Old Testament in the Order of their Development*, New York, 1886, p. 43.

² *Ibid.* p. 45.

³ *Ibid.* p. 55.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 58.

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.
NEW TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE
OF
NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES.

BY
REV. GEORGE H. GILBERT,
PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION,
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CHAPTER I.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

THE past year has been fruitful in this department among both Catholic and Protestant writers. The work of Holtzmann¹ appears in a revised and enlarged edition, the first having been exhausted within a year. New treatises on the entire New Testament have been published by Weiss,² Kaulen,³ and Cornely.⁴ The boundaries of the science are drawn by Weiss more narrowly than by his predecessors. He treats in Part I of the History of the Canon, and in Part II of the History of the Separate Books. The History of the Text, which Holtzmann treats in the body of his work, Weiss discusses briefly in appendixes. Kaulen, on the other hand, abides by the old boundaries of the science, and treats at length of inspiration. Weiss differs again from Holtzmann in excluding the Apocrypha. He limits the subject-matter to the canonical books of the

¹ *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, von H. J. Holtzmann. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Freiburg, I. B., 1886.

² *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, von Bernhard Weiss. Berlin, 1886.

³ *Einleitung in die heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments*, von Franz Kaulen. Zweite Hälfte, zweite Abtheilung: Besondere Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Freiburg, I. B., 1886.

⁴ *Introductio Specialis in singulos Novi Testamenti libros*. R. Cornely. Paris, Lethielleux. This work is favorably mentioned, but we have not been able to secure a copy from Europe.

New Testament. The attitude of Weiss toward his subject is in strong contrast with that of Holtzmann. The latter says that Christianity has been a book-religion from the first, while Weiss gratefully holds that Christianity, from the beginning, has been a life. The order in which these writers treat the different parts of their subject is the same, both, in contrast with Bleek, speaking first of the Canon and then of the Separate Books. Kaulen also treats first of the Canon. In view of such appeals to Christ's words as those of Paul, Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Polycarp, Papias and Justin Martyr, Weiss holds that there was no New Testament Canon in the Church till after the middle of the second century, save the Canon of Christ's words. This existed by the side of the Canon of the Old Testament. These canonic words of Christ were not our present Gospels, indeed were no written gospels; but, on the contrary, were part of the oral tradition, as appears from the fact that Papias, Ignatius, Barnabas, and Clement cite, as coming from the lips of Christ, words that are not found in our writings, or are found there in a modified form.¹ While the Canon of the Four Gospels was fixed before the close of the second century, as appears from Serapion and Irenæus, Weiss holds that this was not the case in Justin's day. Justin, he thinks, regarded the Gospels as truthful historical documents, but not as holy. And yet Weiss admits that Tatian, a pupil of Justin, quotes from the Gospel of John as he would from the Old Testament. Accordingly a change in the Church's attitude toward the Gospels must have taken place rapidly about the middle of the second century. Weiss thinks that this

¹ The author does not seem to give due weight to the fact that the Fathers quoted from memory.

was brought about by the use of the Gospels in public worship.

There was no Canon of New Testament epistles before the time of Justin Martyr. Down to his day there are only isolated and unimportant references to them, and they were probably regarded as the property of individual churches. The first Canon of Paul's Epistles, as appears from Marcion's recognition of it, included ten letters. Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria cite twelve of the Epistles, and the absence of Philemon, since it is dogmatically unimportant, does not argue that it was unknown to them. But though the Gospels and apostolic writings were grouped at the close of the second century, as a New Testament in contrast with the Old, Weiss holds that the Church did not have at this time, and did not need, a fixed Canon. The formation of the Canon progressed more rapidly in the East than in the West, being furthered greatly by Origen, and through the influence of Rufinus and Jerome the results of canonization in the East were made known to the occidental Church. Augustine and Jerome were chiefly instrumental in determining the Canon that was adopted at Hippo and Carthage. Weiss treats the separate books in the following semi-chronological order: Pauline Epistles, Revelation, Catholic Epistles, and Historical Books. The Pauline Epistles are introduced by a compact and comprehensive discussion of the person and work of the great Apostle, and his relation to the Twelve. Against Godet and many writers, Weiss holds that Paul's conversion was in no wise gradual, but immediate, not brought about, as the Tübingen school assert, in the way of reflection, but by the Holy Spirit, through a vision that was directly divine. The author takes occasion

to say, in connection with Paul's sojourn in Arabia, that the Acts are not accurately informed concerning the beginning of Paul's life. The writer, he says, knows nothing of the visit to Arabia, and therefore puts the ministry in Damascus immediately after the conversion. But this inference seems hardly fair to the author of the Acts. The simple fact that a writer does not mention a particular event is not a positive proof that he is unacquainted with it. Various reasons may, conceivably, have led the author of the Acts to omit the Arabian sojourn. Again, in discussing Acts xi. 30 and xii. 25, Weiss, as it seems to us, unnecessarily gives up the historical accuracy of the book. In speaking of Paul's relation to the Twelve, Weiss expresses the opinion that Christ did not give to his Apostles a command to go into all the world, preaching the Gospel. He sent them rather to Israel, and the words in Luke xxiv. 27 were ascribed to Christ in view of his providential working. This may be taken as an illustration of the liberty which Weiss allows himself in his treatment of the New Testament.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

The genuineness of II Thessalonians, which has been denied by radical critics on the ground that the Anti-christ of Chap. II is Nero, and "he that restrains" is Vespasian, is defended by Weiss, who adopts the ancient view that the restraining power is the Roman government, and that "the man of sin" is the false Messiah of unbelieving Judaism.

In speaking of the Corinthian troubles, Weiss concludes that there were no appointed leaders in that church, be-

cause we have no mention of such in the matter of the disturbances. Had there been presbyters they would have resisted the growing evils. He thinks that Paul left the Christian converts to rule as they might be moved by the Holy Spirit. But this statement needs proof. Such a course would have been contrary to Paul's method. The fact that no mention is made of efforts on the part of church officers to check the evil tendencies is not sufficient proof that there were no such officers. They may have shared the evil tendencies, or, if not, may have feared to oppose them.

On the much-discussed problem of the Corinthian parties we have a monograph of 318 pages by Dr. Rübiger of Breslau.¹ The first edition of this work appeared forty years ago. The present volume takes account of the numerous writings on the subject which have appeared since that date. The author's views are, in the main, unchanged. He holds that there were only three parties in Corinth, named after Paul, Peter, and Apollos. There was no Christ-party, but each of the three parties laid claim to a special relation to Christ. He finds reason for doubting, at the outset, the existence of a fourth party, in the circumstance that the ancient commentators did not accept one, and in the fact that modern commentators have not been able to agree who constituted the Christ-party, or what its characteristics were. He seeks to prove his position exegetically. He then endeavors to show that the Epistles are satisfactorily explained on the hypothesis of three parties, and that a fourth would introduce confusion.

¹ *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Inhalt der beiden Briefe des Apostel Paulus an die Korinthische Gemeinde mit Rücksicht auf die in ihr herrschenden Streitigkeiten.* Von Dr. J. F. Rübiger. Breslau, 1886.

He characterizes the Paul-party as the kernel of the Church, in the main right in doctrine and conduct; the Apollos party consisted of rich and cultivated Greeks who found in Christianity a new doctrine rather than a new life; the Peter-party consisted of strongly Judaizing Christians, who used every means to weaken Paul's authority and to confirm Peter's. Schnedermann says that nothing definite is known of the Christ-party, but it is easy to regard them as Jewish Christians.¹

Weiss agrees with Meyer, Godet, and others, that the Church at Rome was Pauline in doctrine and essentially Gentile in nationality. He therefore rejects the Tübingen idea that the aim of the Epistle is polemic. Weiss himself has a somewhat peculiar view of the aim. He thinks that Paul's object was to put into literary form the spiritual product of the years of conflict with Judaism. A presentation of his doctrine had become a necessity to him, in which its grounds should be thoroughly set forth, and its relation to the Old Testament and to the claims of Israel be discussed. That this presentation took the form of a letter rather than a book was due to Paul's literary habit. With this statement we cannot wholly agree. Paul wrote his letters to meet objective needs rather than to satisfy an impulse to literary production. There is no evidence that we should have had the doctrinal statement of the Epistle to the Romans if there had not been a Roman Church. Paul might have presented that doctrine many times with the living voice — doubtless he did so present the substance of it — but the Church at Rome was the reason for a written presentation of it. Weiss holds the gen-

¹ *Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments sowie zu den Apokryphen.* Dritte Abtheilung. Nördlingen, 1888.

uineness of the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, but gives up the integrity of xvi. 1-20, which passage constituted, as he thinks, a letter of recommendation to the Church at Ephesus, to be taken thither by Phœbe, the person recommended. But how this document became incorporated in the independent letter to the Roman Church, and how it came to stand just where it does, he does not attempt to explain. This is more difficult than to defend the integrity. Dr. Kaulen still defends the view that the Church at Rome was founded by Peter, and that this apostle was bishop there for twenty-five years, though not a constant resident. Luthardt¹ passes lightly over the beginning of the Roman Church, saying, "obviously" it was Jewish Christians who introduced the Gospel into Rome. Others think it quite as obvious that Gentile Christians founded the Roman Church.

On the difficult question whether the Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians were written during the Cæsarean or Roman imprisonment, Weiss decides against Godet, and in favor of the Cæsarean imprisonment. The somewhat indecisive circumstances on which the decision is based are that when Paul wrote to Philemon he evidently intended, as soon as released, to go to Phrygia, while it appears from Philippians ii. 24 that it was his purpose, in case he was released from prison in Rome, to go to Macedonia, not to Phrygia. Godet² argues that Paul had taken leave of the Church in Asia Minor, and so could not speak as he does in Philemon, verse 22. Further, a runaway would not seek to hide near home, and it was

¹ *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*. Dritte Abtheilung. Nördlingen, 1888.

² See *The Expositor* for February, 1887.

easier to reach distant Rome than it was to reach Cæsarea. Godet¹ agrees with Weiss in holding that the Epistle to the Ephesians was not addressed to the Church at Ephesus. He thinks it was directed to the same group of churches to which the Colossian Church belonged. This is inferred from the close connection between the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians. Strongly against the view that it was sent to the Ephesians is the fact that Paul refers to the readers as those who were personally unknown to him. This was not true of the Ephesian Christians.

In regard to the Pastoral Epistles, Weiss, while holding that a final scientific judgment on their genuineness is not possible, believes that more difficulties are made by the hypothesis that they are not genuine than exist in connection with the hypothesis of their genuineness.

The negative views of Holtzmann concerning the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles are ably met by Prof. F. E. Woodruff.² He holds that very few New Testament books are more strongly fortified by external evidence than are these Epistles. Holtzmann's arguments based on language and style are fully and fairly met. Prof. Woodruff maintains that the Pastoral Epistles have as many characteristic Pauline words, in proportion to their length, as any of Paul's writings, even the four Homologoumena. Further, there is nothing in the errors combated by these Epistles that is peculiar to the second century. Germs of Gnostic error are implied, but such must have been in the air long before Gnosticism became a settled system. Finally, Prof. Woodruff shows that the church organization implied in the Pastoral Epistles is no more complex than that with which the earlier apostolic writings are acquainted.

¹ See *The Expositor* for May, 1887.

² See *The Andover Review* for September, 1886.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

Weiss accepts all the Catholic Epistles as genuine, though admitting that the external evidence leaves the genuineness of II Peter in doubt. Weiss puts the composition of the Epistle of James about the year 55 A.D. Gloag¹ argues for a much earlier date (circa 45 A.D.), and makes this Epistle the earliest book of the New Testament. Mangold also, in the fourth edition of Bleek's Introduction, strongly favors a date prior to 50 A.D. Both Weiss and Gloag hold that the Epistle was addressed to Jewish Christians in the Diaspora. These writers come independently to the conclusion that the Epistle of Jude is not strictly Catholic. Gloag concludes, in regard to II Peter, that the balance of evidence is in favor of the Epistle, although by no means so decidedly as in the case of most of the other books of the New Testament.

THE GOSPELS.

Weiss's solution of the Synoptic problem is already well known. His Introduction adds nothing new. Kaulen derives the Synoptic Gospels from oral tradition alone, but does not remove the objection to his view, which is presented by Luke i. 1. He thinks that the Gospel of Mark fixed the oldest oral tradition, though it is not necessarily the oldest written Gospel. The oral tradition was modified by Matthew and Luke according to the needs of their respective readers, Jews and Gentiles. Holsten² fancies

¹ *Introduction to the Catholic Epistles.* Paton J. Gloag, D.D. T. & T. Clark. Edinburg. 1887.

² *Die synoptischen Evangelien nach der Form ihres Inhalts.* C. Holsten. Heidelberg, 1886.

that he has smoothed the way to a satisfactory solution of the puzzle of agreement and disagreement in the Synoptic Gospels. The conclusions at which he arrives after an analysis of the Gospels are briefly these: Matthew's Gospel is the exalting of the original Petrine consciousness to a conscious universalism, by the removal of Jewish particularism. Universalism is henceforth (*i. e.*, after the fall of Jerusalem) the common ground of Jewish-Christian and Pauline preaching. Mark's Gospel is the union of Paulinism with the life of Jesus, and the grounding of the same in the words and works of the historical Jesus. The life of Jesus is henceforth the common basis of the Jewish-Christian and Pauline Gospel. Luke's Gospel is the first fruit of that development which united Jewish Christianity and Paulinism. The Gospel according to the Hebrews (circa 55 A.D.) announced a legal Gospel, but a false Messiah and a corrupted Christianity. This Gospel, perhaps in a Greek translation, became the basis of our canonical Matthew. It is Petrine, and presents a picture of the Messiah darkened by Jewish notions. Mark restored the picture according to the teaching of Paul. Thoughtful persons must have felt with pain the disagreement between Matthew and Mark. Their difference of conception widened for a time the gulf between Jewish and Pauline Christians. Luke wrote to remove this gulf. He is by no means a pure Paulinist. He is indifferent toward the Pauline understanding of the death of the Messiah. He flattens Paulinism by taking into it the ethical principle of Judaism. He does not give a scientific reconciliation of the conflicting conceptions, but that could not be expected of him. Holsten puts the canonical Matthew after the fall of Jerusalem, Mark and Luke still later. Luke in Chap. i. 1 has Matthew and Mark chiefly

in mind. He omitted such discourses as the Sermon on the Mount, the Parables, the speech against the Pharisees, and the eschatological discourse, because he knew that they were not strictly historical. Holsten has abundant ingenuity and assurance. He writes as though he understood Jesus much better than did the original Apostles. His analysis of the Gospels, while professing to be peculiarly objective, seems to us to be peculiarly arbitrary. It claims to be scientific, but at the same time it ignores facts of history that are well established. His book is a laborious effort to substantiate out of the Synoptic Gospels a hypothesis which he has brought to them from elsewhere. Nösgen¹ holds that every attempt to derive, from the Synoptic Gospels, an original writing must underestimate their differences and exaggerate their points of agreement.

The genuineness of the Fourth Gospel is defended by Weiss against all opponents. And yet he thinks that this Gospel contradicts the Synoptic tradition in many points, and in many intentionally corrects it. The relation of John's Gospel to the others can be explained only when we admit that the Gospel contains a presentation of the apostolic recollections according to ideal points of view, and a version of Christ's discourses with a Johannean explanation and interpretation.

THE ACTS.

Zoeckler² leaves the question open whether this book was composed shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, or some time afterward. He holds that the missionary

¹ *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*. Erste Abtheilung. Nördlingen, 1886.

² *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*. Zweite Abtheilung. Nördlingen, 1886.

thought dominates the book, and agrees with Lechler that the Acts narrates the course of Christianity from the Jews to the Gentiles.

THE APOCALYPSE.

Weiss thinks that Irenæus is manifestly wrong in his statement that the Apocalypse was seen toward the close of Domitian's reign. He holds that it was seen much earlier; indeed, before the destruction of Jerusalem. This he infers from xi. 1, the passage referring to the measurement of the temple. In view of xvii. 6; xviii. 20; and vi. 10, he thinks that the book was composed a few years after the last Neronic persecution. Eberhard Vischer¹ comes forward with a new hypothesis concerning the origin of the Apocalypse, hardly less startling or more reasonable than Donnelly's speculation that Bacon wrote the dramas of Shakespeare. It is indorsed by Prof. Adolf Harnack, who regards it as the veritable "egg of Columbus." Our Apocalypse, according to this new theory, is a Christian revision of a Jewish apocalypse. The original writing was intensely Jewish; the revision is from the stand-point of the broadest Christianity. The hypothesis is said to find the amplest support in the two-fold character of the Apocalypse. It will be sufficient for the present purpose to notice Vischer's method, and some salient points in his investigation. He says that it is not improbable, a priori, that our Apocalypse is the revision of an earlier writing. Proof for this statement is found in the fact that the Jewish apocalypses have undergone modifications. Thus the

¹ *Die Offenbarung Johannis eine jüdische Apokalypse in christlicher Bearbeitung.* Von E. Vischer, mit einem Nachwort von Adolf Harnack. Leipzig, 1886.

author assumes that the canonical Apocalypse belongs to the same class with the Jewish apocalypses, not only in form but also in matter, and then on the basis of this assumption he declares what is probable a priori. The problem of the book, according to Vischer, is that two entirely different conceptions run through it. As sufficient proof of this two-fold conception, he mentions the following points: "In chapter vii. 1-8 only a small number, to wit, 144,000, out of each of the tribes of Israel 12,000, appear as sealed, and so as partakers of the future kingdom of God, while there is absolutely no mention of the heathen. But by the side of this it is explicitly said that a countless multitude out of all the nations of the earth, purified by the blood of the Lamb, will have a part in the heavenly bliss, in spite of the fact that, in other places, the heathen in their totality are designated as hardened and rejected." But it is an assumption to say that 144,000 is "a small number." The author seems to regard it as literal, though nothing could be plainer than that the writer of the Apocalypse meant it in a symbolical sense. It is a well-known fact that numbers are used symbolically throughout the entire Apocalypse. Then the circumstance that the same number are sealed from each tribe, though the tribes were always very unequal, is sufficient evidence that this number is not to be taken literally. Vischer also assumes that "Israel" is employed here in its national sense. This certainly is not necessary, for the term had long been used of the whole body of true believers (see Gal. vi. 6; Eph. ii. 12; Rom. ix. 6).

Vischer's statement that the Apocalypse in other places represents the heathen in their totality as hardened and rejected conflicts with Chap. xxi. 24-26, which passage

speaks of the nations as walking in the light of the New Jerusalem, and declares that the kings of the earth bring their glory into it. All differences of expression in Chap. vii. 1-8, and 9-17, are easily explained if we regard the change of position as we pass from the first scene to the second. One is earthly, the other heavenly. One is in the face of tribulation, the other after all tribulation has passed. In the matter of sealing it was natural to specify the character and the number of those to be sealed. Only the servants of God, but all of them, without exception. The definite number is an assurance that God forgets no one of his — an assurance that is eminently proper in view of the evil day. There is no reference to sealing in the second scene, because the saints in heaven are beyond tribulation. Again, from the heavenly stand-point, it was both natural and comforting to refer to the multitudinousness of the redeemed rather than to the exact number.

It is plain from the foregoing that Vischer asks us to admit the correctness of particular interpretations, and that we must do this before the text yields the desired contrast. Vischer's second example is from iii. 9 and xi. 1. In the former he assumes that the persons who are designated as being of "the synagogue of Satan" are the "Jews who have remained in the old faith," and he also assumes that the worshipers of xi. 1 are the Jews, the same Jews that iii. 9 brands with the name of "synagogue of Satan." It is not quite probable that a church of average intelligence would have regarded as divine a book that abounded in such patent contradictions, but, aside from this consideration, it is to be noticed that Vischer does not give, in either case, the interpretation that is best supported. They of the "synagogue of Satan" are by no means de-

clared to be all Jews who still hold to Moses and the prophets. Such a sweeping rejection would be inconsistent with the general promises made to the Seven Churches, promises making no distinction between Jew and Gentile; and it would be utterly inconsistent with the harmony known to have existed in the apostolic age between Jewish Christians of the type of James, and Gentile Christians. Finally, Vischer finds his imaginary two-fold conception in the designation of Jerusalem as the "holy city" and as "Sodom." Here we see plainly, he says, the Jewish writer and the Christian writer. But it would be as reasonable to say that the designation of Christians as "saints" is inconsistent with the recognized fact that they are sinners. Jerusalem, as the chosen dwelling-place of Jehovah for centuries, was, and still is, in a peculiar sense, the "holy city," though its inhabitants may be corrupt as those of Sodom.

These are the points that Vischer speaks of in the chapter on the "Problem." We hold that he does not prove the existence of his problem. There is matter in the second and third chapters of his treatise that might be spoken of in this connection, for there is no logical division of his chapters, but it does not strengthen his argument. The problem which he attempts to solve does not exist, and therefore it is not necessary to consider his solution. He makes out a fair case if his premises are granted, but they are not granted. The passages which he finds full of conflict are capable of a harmonious interpretation. It is plain from a study of Vischer's work that he ignores the symbolic, poetic character of the Apocalypse. This is a radical fault. No one can criticise a poem who has no sense of the poetical. The truth of

Raphael's Sistine Madonna is not to be reached with a pair of compasses and a measuring tape. It is also to be regretted that Vischer is unacquainted with the literature of the Apocalypse. More light has been shed on the book than he seems to be aware of. Further, his method of criticism is too arbitrary to be convincing. But, allowing him to make his premises and choose his method, the result at which he arrives is a difficulty far greater than any which a rational exegesis of the Apocalypse still leaves unexplained. It is inconceivable that a Christian, having no sympathy with Judaism, should chose an intensely Jewish writing to constitute the foundation and most of the superstructure of an Apocalypse designed for the Christian Church, and it is also impossible to conceive how the Gentile Christian Church (such were the Seven Churches) could accept this writing as an inspired message.

A very different work on the Apocalypse is that by Prof. Milligan.¹ It is broad in spirit, scientific in method, clear and learned in statement. Prof. Milligan takes the position that the figurative language of the Apocalypse is as truly amenable to rules as is any part of the New Testament. John did not use symbols to conceal thought, but to convey it. Prof. Milligan holds that the Apocalypse follows closely the lines of Christ's eschatological discourse. It was not influenced by other apocalyptic literature, though having some ground in common with it. His view of the structure of the Apocalypse is that the visions are synchronistic. The Contemporary Theory of interpretation, so much in vogue in our day, is to be rejected, according to Prof. Milligan, on exegetical grounds. He holds that the Apoca-

¹ *The Revelation of St. John.* By William Milligan, D.D. London. Macmillan & Co., 1886.

lypse is spiritual and universal in its thought. It sets before us the action of great principles, and so is in keeping with Bible prophecy in general. The ruling ideas of the book are conflict, preservation, and triumph. The binding of Satan and the reign of the saints are ideal pictures of what the Redeemer did for his people. The number 1,000 signifies completeness. The New Jerusalem is an ideal representation of the Church of Christ as that now exists. The author discusses, in appendixes, the questions of authorship, relation to the Fourth Gospel, date of composition, and unity. He accepts the Irenæan date for the composition of the Apocalypse, and defends it with forcible arguments.

CHAPTER II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT.

THE series of Old Latin Biblical Texts,¹ published by the Bishop of Salisbury and associates, now includes No. II. The new volume contains the Bobbio MS. (k), "together with other fragments usually cited as n, o, p, a₂, s, and t," and valuable introductory and explanatory matter. This Latin MS. contains portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew, and belongs, according to Scrivener, to the fourth or fifth century. The editors regard it as the oldest extant representation of the African version of the Gospels. It is edited now for the third time, and more accurately than before. The Greek which it implies resembles that of the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices. This volume adds to the trustworthy material for the elucidation and determination of the Greek text of the New Testament. A MS.² containing "the Pericope de Adultera, the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third Epistles

¹ *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. 2. Portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew from the Bobbio MS. (k), together with other fragments usually cited as *n*, *o*, *p*, *a*₂, *s*, and *t*. By John Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury, W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., and H. White, M.A. Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1886.

² See Prof. Isaac H. Hall, Ph.D., in *The Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, for December, 1886.

of John, the Apocalypse, and a small tractate of Ephrem Syrus," which was lost about 250 years ago, has been discovered in Dublin by the Rev. John Gwynn, D.D. It is supposed to have been copied from a MS. in the monastery of Kenobin on Mt. Lebanon just before it was sent to Archbishop Ussher in 1627. The MS. is regarded by Dr. Gwynn as especially valuable for the text of the Apocalypse.

The number of editions of the New Testament text has recently been increased by three important works. The Resultant Greek Testament¹ compares the labors of a large number of critical scholars. Perhaps it compares the labors of too many, since Ellicott and Alford can hardly be called textual authorities. The "resultant text" is substantially that in which Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort agree.

Gebhardt² has edited the New Testament text, basing his work essentially on the third edition of Tischendorf. He gives the readings of Westcott and Hort at the foot of the page. No other critical editors are compared with Tischendorf. Manifestly Gebhardt does not regard the labor of the English critics as a "splendidum peccatum." Some minor changes are introduced into the text of Tischendorf, as, for instance, printing quotations from the Old Testament in bolder type, and indicating by an asterisk in the margin such matter as refers more or less indirectly to

¹ *The Resultant Greek Testament*, exhibiting the text in which the majority of modern editors are agreed, and containing all the readings of Stephens (1550), Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Lightfoot for the Epistles of St. Paul, Ellicott for the Epistles of St. Paul, Alford, Weiss for Matthew, the Bâle Edition (1880), Westcott and Hort, and the Revision Committee. R. F. Weymouth, D. Lit. London, 1886.

² *Novum Testamentum Græce ex ultima Tischendorffii recensione*, edidit Oscar de Gebhardt. Ex officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz. Lipsiae, 1887.

the Old Testament. A third edition of Dr. Scrivener's 'Greek New Testament (first edition 1859, second edition 1876) contains some noticeable additions. The readings of Westcott and Hort, and of the text translated by the revisers, together with those of Beza, Elzevir, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, are given at the bottom of the page. On the right hand margin we find a selection of parallel references, and on the left the numbers of the *τίτλοι*, and the Eusebian Canons. The practical character of the parallel references no one will question. The work is beautifully printed, and gives in a compact and convenient form the results of the chief critical labors. Like the Greek Testament of Dr. Weymouth, this also ought to make the New Testament Greek studies lighter and more attractive.

The friendly coöperation of English and American scholars is again rendering good service in the "Theological Educator," a series of practical manuals edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A. The aim is not to make contributions to the present fund of knowledge, but to render that knowledge widely helpful; not to make new investigations, but to stimulate investigation by the accurate statement of approved methods of work, and also of the results secured by these methods. Among the first volumes of this series is a manual on New Testament textual criticism.² It modestly purports to be a "primer," not

¹ Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. *Novum Testamentum textûs Stephanice, A.D. 1550*, cum variis lectionibus editionum Bezae, Elzeviri, Lachmanni, Tischendorffii, Tregellesii, Westcott-Hortii, Versionis Anglicanae Emendatorum, F. H. A. Scrivener, A.M., D.C.L., LL.D. Novi Eboraci, Henricus Holt et Socii. MDCCCLXXXVII.

² *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.* By the Rev. Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D. New York. Th. Whittaker, 2-3 Bible House, 1887.

to the "science," but to the "art," of textual criticism, yet it contains 225 pages of such well ordered and valuable information that it leaves little to be desired. In his introductory words the author shows the necessity of textual criticism wherever a perfectly accurate text is desired, and defines such criticism as "the careful, critical examination of a text, with a view to discovering its condition, in order that we may test its correctness on the one hand, and, on the other, emend its errors." The task presented to the critic by the New Testament is great or small according to the standard with which the New Testament is compared. Its current text appears very corrupt when compared with an ordinarily well printed modern book, but it is marvelously correct if compared with any other ancient writing. Dr. Warfield approves the words of Richard Bentley, as applied to the most corrupt form of the New Testament, that "the real text of the sacred writers is competently exact nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst by design out of the whole lump of readings." The body of the work falls into four chapters, which deal with the Matter, the Methods, the Praxis, and the History of Textual Criticism as applied to the New Testament.

The advances made in rendering the MSS. more legible are clearly sketched, beginning with the "handy edition" of the New Testament which Deacon Euthalius published in 458, and coming down to the verse division made by Robert Stephen in 1551. The author places the African form of the old Latin translation as far back as the second century, and thinks there were two European versions before Jerome, giving four Latin versions to be considered in textual criticism.

The chapter on Methods constitutes nearly one half of the book. Though full, it is remarkably concise and clear. The nature of Intrinsic Evidence is stated, and valuable cautions are given touching its use. Under External Evidence the author devotes particular attention to the grouping of the MSS., and illustrates their origin by diagrams. In the chapter on Praxis the author discusses five difficult passages, applying to their textual elucidation the principles previously enunciated. The results are in harmony with the readings of Westcott and Hort. In the closing chapter due credit is given to the school at Antioch, whose critical edition of the New Testament was destined to perform so great service in coming ages. On the whole, this little volume of Dr. Warfield is an honor to American scholarship, and will be very welcome to the general student of textual criticism.

CHAPTER III.

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY.

THE second volume of Prof. Beyschlag's ¹ "Leben Jesu," published in numbers and completed in 1886, is descriptive, while the first, noticed in last year's "Current Discussions," is purely critical. One volume is for the scholar, the other for laymen. If the critical investigations were woven into the story, the average reader would be repelled by them, and hence the division of matter seems to serve a practical end. But the plan has faults. Since the author has discussed certain points in the first volume, he is naturally inclined to pass over them in the second, without, in every case, making his position clear. The reader must refer to the critical part to learn what the author holds, for instance, concerning the alleged miraculous conception of Jesus. The narrative volume leaves his position obscure. As Prof. Weiss ² says, in reading many of the historical statements of the second part one feels the lack of the underlying reasons, which cannot in every instance be carried over from the investigation of the first. Then, too, the separation of the critical investi-

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, von Willibald Beyschlag, Zweiter, darstellender Theil. Halle, 1885-1886.

² See *Andover Review*, November, 1886.

gation from the facts of the Gospel narrative, which they are designed to explain, seems to weaken the force of those investigations.

The second volume begins with three admirable chapters on the Ancient World, the Chosen People, and the Age of Herod. No better historical setting of the life of Jesus has been given. In the last of these chapters, with the help of the first volume, we learn the author's view of the infancy of Jesus. He was born of earthly parents, mother and father. Joseph went to Bethlehem, not on account of the census, but purposely, to fulfil the prophecy of Micah v. 2; and the shepherds who came to see the child did so because Joseph had told them his secret. Beyschlag regards the Gospel narrative of these events as fictitious, although he admits some grains of historical truth. His conclusion is based on the alleged discrepancy between the accounts of Matthew and Luke. We do not think, however, that he has proven a discrepancy in a single instance. His method at this point seems more dogmatic than historical.

If the miraculous conception seemed to him to be ideally necessary, he would, as it appears, accept it on the ground of the Gospel narrative. Beyschlag holds with Weiss and others, against the earlier view, that Jesus was not conscious of being the Messiah until his baptism. He had a feeling that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, and that he should sustain an intimate, perhaps important, relation to it, but neither from the uncertain Messianic promises, nor from his parents, did Jesus attain to a definite consciousness of his calling. The author lays great stress on the baptism of Jesus, as being, in his judgment, the most important event between Jesus' birth and death. The

vision of which the Evangelists speak was John's, wrongly attributed to Jesus by them. Jesus did not decide to be the Messiah, but the Father helped him to recognize himself as such in the moment after baptism. The temptation is a proof that his Messianic consciousness was something new. He had not thought out the method of realizing the kingdom of heaven. His conception of that kingdom was, at first, none other than the prophets had held before him. It was a kingdom of peace and righteousness, but still a material, earthly kingdom. He was a king, but the hour for him to ascend the throne retreated before him. Kingdom and kingship were gradually transfigured to spiritual realities. In the seventh chapter, which treats of the first victories of Jesus, we meet with a number of statements characteristic of the author's stand-point. His method of dealing with the miraculous is illustrated by his explanation of the miracle at the marriage feast in Cana. Jesus orders the servants to set before the wedding guests "simple, clear water," and then, by virtue of his will, which controls them, they think that they are drinking most costly wine. The author speaks of this influence of Jesus as a genuine "miracle." The author quietly assumes that the wedding guests were all under the sway of Jesus, and, indeed, so thoroughly under his control, and so thoroughly in sympathy with him, that simple water from his hand seemed costly wine. Of such an influence the text gives no indication, and the life of Jesus affords no parallel. The author says of the healing of the woman who touched the hem of Jesus' garment, "It is without doubt one of those subjective, momentary miracles, such as faith, with its great excitement even of the physical life, has not seldom wrought." Hence, of course, the

statement of the Evangelists, that power went out from Jesus, is only the popular explanation of the cure. No fact corresponded to it. One more illustration of the author's treatment of miracles will perhaps suffice to characterize his position. The event in question is the feeding of the multitude. Since the Evangelists do not say where the provisions came from, we are at liberty to explain that point as we please. The miracle was on this wise: "As Jesus, in lofty faith and self-forgetting love, began to give what he had for himself and his disciples, God opened the hearts of some among the people, who had provisions concealed, so that they, moved by his act, laid what they had at his feet. The disciples knew not whence the provisions came." It is assumed here by the author that many in the multitude had provisions—an assumption whose probability should be shown, and it is also assumed that these provisions could be brought and laid at Jesus' feet without the knowledge of the disciples, who as waiters were constantly coming and going. It need not be said that this explanation conflicts with the simple Gospel narrative. It obliges us to suppose that the writers, one and all, were mistaken, and that they recorded as a great miracle what was nothing more than the happy influence of a noble example. The author sets himself squarely against the apostle John in the interpretation of Jesus' words concerning the temple, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will build it up again." John says (ii. 21), "He spake of the temple of his body." Beyschlag says that it was impossible at that time for Jesus to foretell his death and resurrection, and if it had been possible, it would have been unintelligible and unwise. "We understand to-day," he says, "that Jesus could speak only of

that temple which he had just cleansed — of this temple, not indeed as a work of dead stone, but as the place of true worship on earth." We might ask how the temple, as a mere locality, could be broken down or built up.

Examples parallel to the above might be given in considerable numbers. For one who takes such a critical position toward the word of God, there is nothing strange in preferring the authority of Josephus to that of the Evangelists, as Beyschlag does in the matter of John's imprisonment. According to Mark, Herod put John in prison because the prophet had arraigned the immoral conduct of the prince; according to Josephus it was for political reasons. The author thinks it quite improbable that John would have referred to the private affairs of his ruler in his sermons. But it is an assumption to say that it was a private affair. It is easily conceivable that it was a notorious fact, and it seems wholly in keeping with the character and mission of John that he should denounce it.

The author regards the arrest of John as a turning-point in the career of Jesus. It was to Him a divine indication that the kingdom of heaven was to be extended, not by arms but in a slow and humble way, by the triumph of His truth over individual souls. Jesus acted on this hint. In consequence of this changed conception of the kingdom, there came to Jesus the thought of a departure, and a second coming.

An instructive example of the author's exegesis is found in his remarks on the story of the man who was let down through the roof. He says that the unfortunate man had set all his hope on Jesus, and as he was not able to press through to him, he had the bearers carry him up, by way of the outer stairs, to the flat roof, and lower him through

the door which led down from thence, which door, according to Mark, had to be made wider by removing some of the tiles. Jesus saw in the heroic means a heroic faith. This can hardly be called exegesis. The Evangelists do not say that the sick man had faith, much less a heroic faith, but only that they, the bearers, had faith, the statement perhaps including the sick man also. It is hardly probable that they would have brought him if he had not had faith. The Evangelists give no hint of a door in the roof, and, indeed, their language is not harmonizable with such a view. As there is no hint of a door, so of course there is no hint of "widening" a door.

Beyschlag emphasizes the humanity of Jesus, while not wishing to obscure his divinity. He holds that the development of Jesus was truly human, his mental processes those of a wise man with a pure heart. Jesus was neither almighty nor all-wise. He exercised supernatural power and wisdom only as they were granted him by his Father for the Messianic work.

The author agrees with Weiss that Jesus celebrated a Passover meal with his disciples on the 13th of Nisan, *i. e.*, a day before the legal time for the Passover. He regards the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection as visits from heaven, Jesus having really ascended on the day of his resurrection.

As a whole, the second volume of Beyschlag's work, while in some radical points open to criticism, is a worthy conclusion of the first. It is full of thought, and is written in a singularly attractive style. It is manifestly the work of one who adores and loves the risen Lord.

The second part of Dr. Schürer's *History*¹ of the Jewish

¹ *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, von D. Emil Schürer. Zweiter Theil: Die inneren Zustände Palestina's und des Jüdi-

People in the Age of Jesus Christ is an important addition to the literature of this subject. It is an enlargement of the author's manual of New Testament contemporary history. That had less than 300 pages in the German edition; this has nearly 900 pages. Only three new paragraphs are added, but the old ones have been almost entirely re-wrought. The new paragraphs treat of the Priesthood and Temple Worship (68 pp.), and of the Palestinian and Hellenistic Jewish Literature (255 pp.). The indexes which we miss in this second volume will be given with the first. From the second chapter of the work onward we have a comprehensive bibliography. Every chapter is instructive for the understanding of the New Testament. In the second we learn that after the death of Herod the Great, Jerusalem had no civil jurisdiction outside of Judea, hence had no power over Jesus while he remained in Galilee. The competence of the Sanhedrin was left comparatively intact by the Romans. It exercised civil jurisdiction, and, to a certain extent, criminal also. While the Procurator could, if he chose, pronounce the death sentence in accordance with the Jewish law, as the Jews endeavored to have him do in the case of Jesus, he was independent of the Sanhedrin, and could proceed freely in any sort of prosecution.

Schürer holds that, when Jesus was condemned, the Sanhedrin convened in the high priest's palace, as the gates of the temple mount were still locked, it being night. Wherever the author has occasion to speak of the canonical books of the Old Testament, it is not difficult to determine his position. He believes, for instance, that the Chronicles modify the Kings for a special purpose, its additions being not historical, but dogmatic and fictitious

(p. 279). The Priests' Codex was written in the interest of priestly ceremony (p. 254).

The history, character, and functions of the Scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees are ably discussed. Schürer adopts Wellhausen's characterization of the Pharisees and Sadducees, holding that the former represent the legal tendency, the latter the social. He thinks the name "Pharisee" was given by non-Pharisees, and embodied contempt, being equivalent to "separatist." The Pharisees called themselves "chaberim" neighbors, and regarded all non-Pharisees as unclean. Schürer derives the name "Sadducee" from the proper name "Zadok," and thinks that it came to be applied from the fact that the Zadokites had charge of the temple worship.

The volume makes a valuable contribution on the Jewish literature of Palestine and the Diaspora, not simply in the time of Christ, but for several centuries before and after Christ's time. This embraces History, Psalmody, Proverbs, Parentic Narrative, Prophecy, Sacred Legend, Books on Incantation, Translations of Scripture, Supplements to the Biblical Literature, Epic and Dramatic Poetry, Philosophy, Apologetics, and Propagandist writings. Schürer's work is thorough and comprehensive, but opinions differ as to the value of the Jewish sources on which it is based.

The problems of the early Church are exhaustively and interestingly discussed by Weizsaecker,¹ and are ostensibly solved according to modified Tübingen methods. The volume treats of the Oldest Jewish Congregation, the Apostle Paul, the Pauline Church, the Later Development, and, finally, of Meetings, Constitution, and Morals. The au-

¹ *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche.* Von Carl Weizsaecker, Freiburg, I. B., 1886.

thor's stand-point and critical method are distinct, and may be estimated from his discussion of the appearances of Jesus after the resurrection. Any other discussion in the volume would present the same salient features. Weizsaecker holds that the best historical account of the appearances of the Risen One is that of Paul in 1 Cor. xv. This knows nothing of the Synoptic story that certain women saw Jesus near the empty tomb; therefore this is not historical. The appearances, according to Paul, do not occur at the grave, and they extend through a considerable period of time. There is no historical confirmation of a corporeal appearance of Jesus, since Paul's record says nothing of it. The other appearances of Jesus are to be judged according to that which Paul experienced. On examining the three-fold narrative of this appearance the author concludes that no reliable tradition of the event existed. What the appearance was is to be determined, therefore, from Paul's statements in other places, especially from Philippians iii. 21; 1 Corinthians xv; and Romans i. 4. From these we conclude that Paul saw a spiritual body; therefore the seeing was spiritual. Now Paul puts the appearances of Jesus to himself on a level with those to the original Apostles. His is spiritual; therefore those are spiritual also. Further, in regard to this pneumatic seeing, such as Paul's vision of the Risen One, the author holds that it is communicable under certain circumstances. The separate appearances recorded by Paul proceed from a first impulse. Peter had a heavenly vision, and he became the leader of the "great movement." What he experienced, his companions also experienced. Paul, on his way to Damascus, had a vision like Peter's. As for his blindness and healing, these are manifestly only symbolic. The author regards the narra-

tive in Acts concerning the extension of Christianity in Jerusalem after Pentecost as in many respects a freely created narrative. So, for instance, the numbers of converts, three thousand and five thousand. The miracle of Pentecost is manifestly copied after Jewish legends. The narrative concerning Ananias can make no claim to a historic character. The writer of the Acts had a wrong and impossible conception of the method of extending the faith in the Messiah. It was not, as he says, by open public preaching, but in secrecy. It was doubtless modeled after the first missionary work of the Apostles in the life-time of Jesus. That was private in its nature. True, Matthew x. 27 does not speak of secret working, but this is not the original direction of the Lord. It is a modification of later times. So the author rejects the narrative in Acts as fictitious, and immediately constructs one of his own, and that, not on the basis of clear Scripture, but on what he conceives to have been the original meaning of Jesus. As regards the "original meaning" of Jesus, some may be inclined to accept the explanation of nineteenth century rationalism, but others will surely persist in esteeming it quite as rational and scientific to trust the narrative of Christian writers whose generation immediately followed that of the Lord himself, a narrative simple, self-consistent, and possessing every claim to be regarded as strictly historical.

CHAPTER IV.

NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION.

I. PHILOLOGICAL AIDS.

PROBABLY no theological publication of the year 1886 is of such permanent and far-reaching importance as Grimm's ¹ New Testament Lexicon, translated and revised by Prof. Thayer. It belongs to the class of books which are most essential to the student of the Bible in its original tongues, and it is the best of its class for the New Testament. Its influence lies at the root of things. It helps the student to determine the significance of the words of the New Testament, which are "the στοιχεῖα of Christian theology." It brings to his aid the ripe fruit of generations of patient, devoted scholarship. A good lexicon is incomparably better than the best commentary for all scholarly ends. The free use of commentaries may make a full mind, but it is the faithful use of grammar and lexicon that makes the ready, trustworthy, skillful mind in the sphere of the New Testament. Dr. Trench, in the Preface to the Eighth Edition of his Synonyms, says: "There are few

¹ *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, translated, revised, and enlarged by Joseph Henry Thayer, D.D. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1887.

things which a theological teacher should have more at heart than to awaken in his scholars an enthusiasm for the grammar and the lexicon." The lexicon of which we are now speaking will make it easier than ever before to awaken such enthusiasm.

The work of the translator and reviser has perhaps doubled the value of the original lexicon of Grimm. Prof. Thayer has verified all Biblical and classical references, has added the readings of Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, and, most important of all, has given numerous references to grammars, to recent exegetical works, to Bible dictionaries, and to Lives of Christ and of Paul. These references abound throughout the work, a most valuable guide and a constant stimulus to the ambitious student. It may be questioned whether the addition of synonyms (77 paragraphs) increases the value of the work. Not enough are given to enable the average student to dispense with an independent work on synonyms, and yet it is not improbable that enough are given to tempt the student thus to do. Might not the list have been enlarged sufficiently to meet the needs of the average student by giving up for the purpose the space set apart for verbal forms in the Appendix?¹ The translation of the original Latin has been in the main faithfully performed. It could be desired that the translator had uniformly used the masculine pronoun when referring to the Holy Spirit. As it is, he has employed the masculine five times and the neuter eleven. In the original, when the Latin has a special form for the masculine, that form is, we believe, always employed.

¹ See *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, June, 1887, Prof. Warfield's review of the Lexicon.

With regard now to the original work of Grimm, while its high character is generally and gratefully recognized, it must nevertheless be admitted that it is open to some severe criticisms, which, since the book will help to form the beliefs of many theological students, ought faithfully to be made.

The lexicographer sometimes oversteps his limits,¹ going out of his way to be the special pleader of interpretations which are abandoned by the best commentators, or he speaks arbitrarily on questions that are confessedly open.

Further, he criticises the word of Scripture with more freedom than we should be willing to allow. In support and illustration of these statements some passages of the *Lexicon* must be considered. Grimm says (p. 1, col. 2) that Mark confounds Abiathar with Ahimelech, his father, when speaking of David and the shew-bread. But this is an open question, where such dogmatic statement is hardly in place. Meyer and Lindsay, it is true, and others with them, accept an error in the record, but Alford leaves the problem unsolved, and not a few scholars, from the ancient Euthymius Zigabenus down to Lange and Thayer, believe that the apparent discrepancy is explained by the custom of having two names. As the father-in-law of Moses is called both Raguel and Jethro, so the priest who gave David the shew-bread may have borne the two names Ahimelech and Abiathar. Moreover, this view is supported by certain passages in Samuel and Chronicles as compared with passages in Kings (II. Sam. viii. 17; I. Chron. xxiv. 6,

¹ See Prof. Charles F. Bradley, *The Methodist Review*, March, 1887, p. 265.

21, with II. Sam. xv. 24, ii. 26), from which it appears that the priest who officiated with Zadok is called now Ahimelech and now Abiathar. It is not demonstrable that the same person is intended by these names, but it is probable. In this state of the question, therefore, no one can declare positively that Mark made a mistake; least of all should a lexicographer do this, the nature of whose work prevents his giving the grounds of his belief.

Again, Grimm interprets the difficult passage Rom. v. 7 as follows (p. 3, col. 1): "Hardly for an innocent man does one encounter death; for if he even dares hazard his life for another, he does so for a benefactor."

But this can hardly be said to give the sense of the passage. Grimm says, "an innocent man;" Paul says, "a righteous man" (a positive conception, instead of a negative one). Paul does not say "for a benefactor," but "for the benefactor," if, indeed, we render his word by "benefactor." Grimm's paraphrase departs, then, in two important particulars from the text. It is, however, a disputed point whether any clear distinction is to be made here between *δίκαιος* and *ἀγαθός*. The ancient Greek commentators made none; Meyer, among modern writers, makes none. Godet makes a distinction, but one different from Grimm's. Under these circumstances, therefore, if Grimm gave any interpretation of the passage, he might well have given it as his opinion, and not as the unquestionable meaning. The next view of Grimm that we notice is that concerning the angels of the churches, mentioned in Revelation i. 20 (p. 5, col. 2). Here again we come upon an emphatic assertion, as though the learned author had received some supernatural light on this vexed question. He says: "The angels of the

churches are not their presbyters or bishops, but heavenly spirits." This is more oracular than satisfactory. Robinson, with more modesty, says of the angels: "They are *probably* the prophets or pastors." But looking at the view itself, and not at the temper in which it is put forth, it may be said that it has few supporters. It ought to be abandoned, for, in the first place, heavenly angels could not be rebuked and praised, as are the beings whom John calls "angels of the churches." There is no authority for holding heavenly angels responsible for the wrong-doings of Christian churches. Again, it is an incongruous conception that John, a man, should write to heavenly angels concerning earthly affairs. And, finally, if the messages had concerned heavenly spirits, why were they addressed and sent to earthly churches? We believe that the "angels of the churches" are their pastors (so Plumptre, Lee, Schaff, Godet, and others). This view brings harmony into the messages. It justifies the laying of responsibility on the "angels." This view is also in keeping with the imagery. The churches are "lamp-stands," the pastors are "stars." Both symbols are symbols of light, and so are homogeneous, as they should be to set forth the church and its pastor. Brief notice may be taken, in the next place, of Grimm's interpretation of John ix. 34 (p. 31, col. 1), which reads, in the revision: "Thou wast altogether born in sins." Grimm explains this: "Thou wast covered all over with sins when thou wast born, *i. e.*, didst sin abundantly before thou wast born." Here there seems to be absolutely no occasion for the lexicographer to become an exegete. The word *ὅλος* does not require any special signification. Its meaning is unquestioned. The interpretation which Grimm

gives is by no means the only one. The expression "Thou wast altogether born in sins" may refer to the sins of the parents as properly as to those of the son. Passing on to p. 128, col. 2, of the *Lexicon*, Grimm's interpretation of Acts vii. 55 is to be noticed. Stephen is there said to see Jesus standing on the right hand of God. Grimm says of this attitude that Jesus is standing "as though in indignation at His adversaries He had risen from His heavenly throne." But is it, then, apparent that standing in itself expresses indignation? Meyer says that Jesus stands ready to receive the martyr. Hackett thinks it doubtful whether we are to attach any special significance to the particular attitude. Alford says that Jesus stands, as the Heavenly High Priest, ministering at the throne. The *Speaker's Commentary* says that He is standing as ready to sustain and welcome. No one thinks of Christ's standing as an indication of anger. Here again the legicographer becomes an unsatisfactory exegete.

Grimm says of "the church in one's house" that it means "the company of Christians belonging to a person's family" (p. 196, col. 1). The church in the house of Aquila and Prisca (Rom. xvi. 5) simply means the Christian members of their household. So the church in the house of Nympha (Col. iv. 13), and the church in Philemon's house (Philemon, verse 2). This view of the word *ἐκκλησία* is without support. There is no case where it denotes a purely private gathering. The church is, in idea, a great family, but there is no proof that a family is ever called a church. On the other hand, it is in the highest degree probable that Christians were in the habit of meeting for worship in private houses. Such was

probably the room in which the disciples met before Pentecost (Acts i. 13), and such the room in which they were assembled at the outpouring of the Spirit (Acts ii. 1). We know that Christians were assembled on one occasion, at least, in the house of Mary, the mother of Mark (Acts xii. 12), and such gatherings of Christians for worship in private houses were probably common until the last of the second century. According to the Martyrdom of St. Justin, § 3, the Christians at Rome, as late as 150 A.D., met in several bodies in private rooms. In keeping with such evidence as this, we find the commentators generally opposed to the idea expressed in Grimm's Lexicon, and holding with Robinson that "the church in one's house" signifies "the Christian circle that met at the house of any one." (So Godet, Meyer, Beet, Alford, Sanday, Gifford, Lange, Hodge.) Decidedly characteristic of Grimm's critical position is his interpretation of Luke v. 19 (p. 344, col. 2). Four men came to Jesus bringing a palsied man on a bed. "And not finding by what way they might bring him in, because of the multitude, they went up to the housetop and let him down through the tiles with his couch into the midst before Jesus." Grimm explains the expression "through the tiles" in this way: "through the roof, *i.e.*, through the door in the roof to which a ladder or stairway led up from the street." He then goes on with these words: "Mark describes the occurrence differently, evidently led into error by misapprehending the words of Luke." Prof. Thayer adds to these remarks the following pertinent words: "To say nothing of the improbability of assuming Mark's narrative to be dependent on Luke's, the alleged discrepance disappears if Luke's language is taken literally, 'through the tiles;' he says

nothing of 'the door in the roof.' " These remarks seem eminently just. Grimm would make a discrepancy where none exists. His interpretation assumes that an intelligent contemporary of Luke, a Jew of Jerusalem, a beloved fellow-worker of Paul, was not as well qualified to judge of the meaning of Luke's words as is a scholar of a distant land and of a remote age.

Grimm's position with regard to Paul's death may be briefly noticed. He says (p. 496, col. 2) that Paul's martyrdom took place in Rome in the year 64, and that "the number of those daily grows smaller who venture to defend the ecclesiastical tradition, for which Eusebius is responsible, according to which Paul, released from this imprisonment, is said to have preached in Spain and Asia Minor; and subsequently, imprisoned a second time, to have been at length put to death in Rome, in the year 67 or 68, while Nero was still emperor." Two remarks concerning this statement seem in place: (1) Its tone is more positive than befits what must still be acknowledged to be an unsettled question; (2) It cannot be said that the second view, viz., that Paul suffered martyrdom between 67 and 68, is daily losing defenders. It has no occasion to blush for its supporters. It is defended by Godet, Schmidt, Howson, Lightfoot, Plumptre, Fisher, and Schaff. At any rate, the ancient belief that Paul was released and imprisoned a second time is far too strongly supported to be dealt with as Grimm deals with it. The last point that we will notice is Grimm's explanation of the Apocalyptic number 666 (p. 669, col. 1). Grimm says that this is "a mystic number, the meaning of which is clear when it is written in Hebrew letters, *nērōn kesar*, i.e., Nero Cæsar." Grimm identifies Nero with the Anti-

christ in another place as well as here. (See p. 51, col. 2.) It seems as though the lexicographer were again out of his proper sphere. The explanation of this number belongs to critical exegesis. But, further, Grimm's explanation is untenable, for these reasons: (1) The Apocalypse was written in Greek, to Greek churches in Asia Minor, whose members cannot be supposed to have had the slightest knowledge of the Hebrew alphabet. It is inconceivable that the author would have invited his readers to calculate the number of the beast, when he knew perfectly well that they could not do it, as was surely the case if a knowledge of Hebrew was required. Such an invitation would have been mockery. The Apocalypse was written to be understood, not to mystify people. (2) It is well said (see Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, i. 841-853) that the writer of the Apocalypse distinguishes the beast from the heads, the empire from the emperors. If, then, Nero is one of the seven heads, he cannot be identified with the beast itself. (3) It is utterly inconsistent with the lofty moral and spiritual tone of the Apocalypse to suppose for an instant that its author would have stooped to countenance and adopt the heathen superstition of Nero's return. (4) Again, this explanation is wholly out of harmony with the general scope of the Apocalypse, as not a few writers understand it, and, we think, rightly. The book has to do with the great principles of religious history. It is spiritual and universal.

Grimm seems here again to go out of his way to espouse an untenable hypothesis. But this investigation need not be pursued further. We think enough examples have been adduced to substantiate the criticisms made at

the outset, which may be briefly repeated in this place. (1) Grimm often enters the field of exegesis and historical criticism when it appears as though he had no adequate reason for so doing. (2) As an exegete his tone is not always free from arbitrariness, and not a few of his conclusions are untenable. (3) He is rationalistic in his method of handling Scripture.

A handy lexicon of the New Testament has been compiled in a careful and scholarly way by Prof. F. W. Stellan.¹ This aims to give all the significations of each word as it is used in the New Testament, the period in which the different words came into use, difficult nominal and verbal forms, the etymology of words, and a brief discrimination of the principal synonymous words. The individual words are arranged etymologically, all derivatives from a certain stem being found in one paragraph. The book is designed for use by persons when travelling, or at conferences—in short, when one cannot have access to a large lexicon, and is well adapted to this end.

¹ *Kurzgefasstes Wörterbuch zum griechischen Neuen Testament*, bearbeitet von F. W. Stellan, Leipzig, 1886.

CHAPTER IV.

EXEGESIS.

No work of the past year in this department is more significant than the series of commentaries published under the general editorship of Drs. Strack and Zöckler.¹ Three of the four volumes devoted to the New Testament have already appeared, and the last is to come from the press at an early day. The aim of the work is not to set forth new hypotheses (this is left to the negative critics), and it is not to give an exhaustive exegesis of the difficult passages; but it is rather to set the Bible before the reader in such a way as to help him in understanding its great teachings and to quicken his regard and reverence for it as a divine writing. The editors recognize that in the minute investigation of details the due impression of the whole has been missed. Their purpose is to direct the reader's mind to the great things of the Law and the Gospel, leaving the mint and cummin in the background.

¹ *Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments so wie zu den Apokryphen.* Erste Abtheilung: Die Evangelien nach Matthäus, Markus, und Lukas, erläutert von Dr. C. F. Nösgen. Nördlingen, 1886. Zweite Abtheilung: Das Evangelium nach Johannis und die Apostelgeschichte, erläutert von Dr. Ernst Chr. Luthardt und Dr. Otto Zöckler. Dritte Abtheilung: Die Briefe Pauli an die Thessalonicher, Galater, Korinther, und Römer, ausgelegt von Dr. O. Zöckler, Dr. G. Schnedermann, und Dr. Ernst Chr. Luthardt. Nördlingen, 1888. C. H. Beck'sche Buchhandlung.

The readers had in view are pastors, theological students, and such laymen as seek a higher theological culture. The work, then, belongs to a different order from our popular commentaries. It might be called a popular commentary for technical readers.

Its most noticeable departures from the ordinary exegetical commentary are translation of the entire original and full analysis of the thought. The translation, as we should expect, is directly from the Greek, and differs at almost countless points from even the revised Luther Bible. It is faithful and clear. The analyses of the contents follow the translation in the first volume, but precede it in the second and third. These explanatory paragraphs give the connection and sum of the thought; they are *résumés* as well as analyses. This commentary, then, is not merely a grammatical dissecting-room; it dissects to some extent, but it also reproduces. Neither the connecting paragraphs nor the exegetical notes on the Greek text have much to do with the rationalistic critics. The work is refreshing by reason of the absence of polemical matter. This is not pleasing to the negative critics, and they accuse the new commentary of being unscientific. To be scientific, however, in their sense of the word, would have been to destroy the practical value of the work. Doubtless the work has as good a right to call itself scientific as has any product of the Tübingen School. Faith may be as scientific in its methods as unfaith.

The first volume of this new work contains the Synoptic Gospels, commented upon by Dr. Nösgen. The second volume contains the Gospel according to John, and the Acts, explained by Drs. Luthardt and Zöckler. The

third contains the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians and Galatians, the Epistles to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Romans, interpreted by Drs. Zöckler, Schnedermann, and Luthardt. Each of the volumes contains excursus throughout, excepting only that part of the third which treats of the Epistle to the Romans. It is impossible here to go into details concerning each of these volumes. The series, as a whole, is worthy of high commendation, and it is to be hoped that it may be translated into English.

For the popular interpretation of Luke's¹ Gospel the series of "Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students," edited by Drs. Dods and Whyte, renders good service in the little volume by Rev. Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D. It gleans widely, but wisely. It puts the student in possession of the results of much laborious investigation.

The seventh edition of Meyer's Commentary on the Gospel according to John, edited by Prof. Weiss,² is not essentially different from the sixth edition, which appeared seven years ago. It is to be regretted that the author makes no use of the latest edition of Godet's work on John. In the preface, the author raises the question how the work of Meyer can best be reduced to adapt it to this hurrying age. This is an important question, and it is to be hoped that the editors will agree upon some practical solution.

Without the usual display of critical apparatus Dr.

¹ *The Gospel according to Saint Luke*, with Introduction, Notes, and Maps. By Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark.

² *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Johannes*. Siebente Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Dr. B. Weiss. Göttingen, 1886.

Morison¹ gives a thoroughly critical exposition of the sixth chapter of Romans. It is in an eminent degree exposition, an unfolding of the Apostle's thought. It is free from controversy. The author sets forth in a terse and lucid manner his own conception of the Apostle's thought. He writes for the English student, but at the same time renders the student of the Greek text valuable service. It is not always possible to agree with his interpretations. For instance, he finds in the words "type of doctrine" (v. 17) a reference to the incompleteness of the Gospel which the Romans had received. Their teaching had been fragmentary. But whence do we know this? Surely the words "type of doctrine" do not contain in themselves anything derogatory. And Paul elsewhere commends the Romans for their faith (i. 8), and is "persuaded" that they are "filled with all knowledge." Furthermore, the circumstance that he lays before them his most profound Epistle is not favorable to the view that the Romans had been imperfectly trained. In that case he would rather have fed them with milk. It is more natural to find a reference here to his own type of doctrine, which, as is generally conceded, characterized the Roman congregation. But, on the whole, Dr. Morison's monograph is a valuable contribution to the literature on Romans.

First Corinthians² is annotated in the Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges, by the Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A. The author seems to give undue weight to the older writers, and largely to ignore the works of re-

¹ *Saint Paul's Teaching on Sanctification. A Practical Exposition of Romans vi.* By James Morison. London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1886.

² *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: with Notes, Map, Introduction, and Appendices.* Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A. Cambridge, 1886.

cent years, especially those of German scholars. There certainly can be no doubt about the superiority of modern critical commentaries over that of Calvin, and it is equally plain that the lexical work of Grimm is superior to that of Schleusner. Prof. Warfield¹ explains II. Cor. i. 8-10 in connection with I. Cor. xv. 32, which he takes literally. Paul was in reality cast to the beasts in the arena. This was a concrete illustration of the sufferings to which he had just referred in xv. 31. The connection requires that we should take it literally. The omission of this event from the Acts does not argue against its real occurrence, for it is well known that the Acts omit many of the trying experiences of the Apostle. It is no stranger that Paul came forth alive from the wild beasts than it is that he survived the stoning at Lystra, the shipwrecks and scourgings. (A number of works on the Corinthian Epistles have appeared so recently that an estimate of them cannot be given in this volume — the works of Ellicott, Godet, Heinrici, and Kay.)

A seventh edition of Meyer's Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians is edited by Dr. Sieffert.² In this, the lineaments of Meyer's exegesis are obscured. Only so much of the old remains as is consistent with the new. The reader is often left in doubt as to how far the editor approves of Meyer's views, since the editor's views are not always outwardly indicated as such.

A new edition of Meyer's Commentary on Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon is edited

¹ *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, Dec., 1886.

² *Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, von H. A. W. Meyer. Der Brief an die Galater. Siebente Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Dr. Fried. Sieffert. Göttingen, 1886.

by Dr. Franke.¹ The author aims to modify the commentary of Meyer so that it shall worthily represent the progress made since the death of Meyer. He differs noticeably from Meyer in his interpretation of the difficult passage, Phil. ii. 6.

The First Epistle of John is regarded by Dr. Plummer² as a companion to the Gospel, which designation implies that the Gospel was written first, a point that his table of parallels can hardly be regarded as proving. (See Westcott on the Epistles of John, p. 31.) It may be doubted whether the Epistle alludes in a single instance to the Gospel. Dr. Plummer adds another to the many schemes of dividing the Epistle. It differs at almost every step from that of Dr. Westcott (Introduction, p. 46), as his does from that of Weiss (Einleitung, 455). The impression made by these widely different plans is that nothing more than a few general divisions is certain. Dr. Plummer's little volume has valuable Appendixes, among them one on Antichrist and another on the Three Heavenly Witnesses. He regards the Antichrist of I. John ii. 18 as a person, and the same as the great adversary mentioned by Paul in II. Thess. ii. 3. Appendix D gives an excellent summary of the evidence against the passage on the Three Heavenly Witnesses.

In the exegesis of the Apocalypse no considerable progress has been made the past year. The interpretation given by J. H. McIlvaine is popular in character and devout in spirit, but not always consistent with the principles

¹ *Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser, und Philemon.* Fünfte Auflage, völlig umgearbeitet von Dr. A. H. Franke. Göttingen, 1886.

² *The Epistles of St. John.* By the Rev. A. Plummer, M.A., D.D. Cambridge, 1886.

laid down by the author, and often fanciful. The author belongs to the spiritual interpreters, who hold that the Apocalypse deals with general truths, not with specific events. He defines his special qualifications for his work as a "life-long study and practice in the interpretation of the symbols of the Jewish, Christian, Hindoo, Greek, Roman, with more or less of the Egyptian, Scandinavian, and other religions." It may be seriously doubted whether a knowledge of Hindoo and Egyptian symbols is any special qualification for interpreting the Apocalypse. The book has a better reason for appearing than that which the author gives. He says, "The work is so unlike everything hitherto published on the subject that he is not without hope of its attracting the attention of those who are competent to judge of its merits and defects." No book can claim serious attention simply because it is unlike other books. The present work has, however, weightier merits than this. The author makes a patient attempt to explain Scripture by Scripture, and it can be said that he does not guess at the meaning of a symbol as often as many commentators of earlier days. Those interpretations which are offered as wholly new are the least satisfactory parts of the book. It is impossible to make the symbol of the rider on a white horse refer to the plague of wild beasts, or to make the supernatural locusts a symbol of the diseases of body and mind. The other new interpretations are that of the horses from the Euphrates, which symbolize sudden and violent death, and that of the two witnesses, which are said to be personifications of faith and prayer. I think no one of these interpretations is made to appear probable. But the book is not to be judged entirely by these original interpretations. It is often sober and convincing.

Another practical interpretation of the Apocalypse, based on the work of Prof. Stuart, is given to the public by Dr. I. P. Warren.¹ It represents, in general, the Church History Theory of interpretation. Most of the events predicted in the Revelation belong to the period ending with Constantine. The author thinks it impossible to extend the "shortly" of chap. i. 1 to cover more than two or three centuries. And yet he takes the 1000 years literally, beginning with Constantine's conversion and extending down to the Turkish persecution under Othman I. Now, as the binding of Satan and the reign of the saints are without doubt among the *α δὲ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει*, and by no means the least important of those things, it would appear that the author recognizes the insufficiency of his explanation of the word "shortly." Yet he argues strenuously for it, and denies the possibility of any other interpretation. (See a note by Prof. Briggs in the *Presbyterian Review* for October, 1887.) The author holds that the Apocalypse was communicated in symbols chiefly for the sake of concealing its prophecies from the enemies of the Church, a view which seems to the writer to do injustice to the language of symbols.

It is manifestly inconsistent to take some of the numbers of the Apocalypse symbolically, as seven is taken in chap. i. 4, and others literally, as one thousand is understood in chap. xx. 2, since the writer of the Apocalypse gives no indication of such a change. In keeping with the author's view that the Apocalypse foretells the destruction of Jerusalem is the interpretation of *γῆ* in vi. 4. This is said to refer to Palestine here, and almost always

¹ *The Book of Revelation. An Exposition.* By Israel P. Warren, D.D. Funk and Wagnalls, 1886.

in the New Testament. It seems impossible that one who is at all familiar with the usage of the New Testament should make this statement. A glance at Grimm's Lexicon or Bruder's Concordance is sufficient to show that $\gamma\eta$ is almost always, if not always, accompanied by some specific word when it refers to Palestine, and that in the overwhelming majority of cases $\gamma\eta$ alone does not refer to Palestine. In many other cases the author's exegesis can hardly be regarded as satisfactory. The word rendered in the Revised Version "candlesticks" should be translated, he thinks, by the word "lamps," a meaning which the Greek word never has. Again, he says there "can be no doubt that the composite figures (of chap. iv. 6-8) were intended as symbols of the divine attributes." They stand for "the wisdom, power, eternity, and omniscience of God." But there can be doubt about the correctness of this interpretation, since the majority of modern commentators hold interpretations that are totally different from it. I know of no one beside Dr. Warren who adopts this view. But, intrinsically, is the interpretation probable? Is it conceivable that John would represent the power of God as being full of eyes, as having six wings, and as worshipping God day and night? There is nothing in Scripture to support such a view. Space forbids further reference to particular interpretations. It is to be hoped that these American studies in the Apocalypse may be followed by more critical works. They are welcome as indications of a growing interest in this least understood but not least important book of the New Testament. Both Dr. Warren and Mr. McIlvaine believe thoroughly in the practical value of the Apocalypse, and throughout their books they endeavor to make this value apparent.

Ability to render real service to Christian students consists oftener in the faculty of making new arrangements of old facts than in the power to discover new facts. We have this year a new arrangement of knowledge concerning the New Testament, in Dr. Vincent's volume, *Word Studies in the New Testament*.¹ The author seeks to "take a position midway between the exegetical commentary and the lexicon and grammar, aiming to put the reader of the English Bible nearer to the stand-point of the Greek scholar, by opening to him the native force of the separate words of the New Testament in their lexical sense, their etymology, their history, their inflection, and the peculiarities of their usage by different Evangelists and Apostles." He holds that there is much which the best translator cannot do for the understanding of the individual words, and which can be accomplished more profitably by itself than in a formal commentary.

The work of Dr. Vincent is *sui generis*, combining various departments of exegetical theology. The one idea that controls it is the illumination of the word of Scripture. It aims to be practical and popular, but at the same time the quality of the work is scholarly. It is to be hoped that the author, who is now called to a scholastic life, as a professor in the Union Theological Seminary, will add to this publication yet others in the department of New Testament exegesis.

¹ *Word Studies in the New Testament.* By Marvin R. Vincent, D.D. Vol. i.: The Synoptic Gospels, Acts, and Epistles of Peter, James, and Jude. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.

CHAPTER V.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

THE work of the past year has been chiefly devoted to those branches of New Testament study which logically precede New Testament theology. Thus the preparation for a better elucidation and statement of New Testament teachings is being perfected. Of direct contributions in this department there have been few, but important indirect service has been rendered, as, for instance, by the Grimm-Thayer Lexicon.

The first volume¹ of a new work on the Parables has appeared, a book without title-page, preface, or table of contents, but containing 291 pages of learned matter.

The author discusses the Genuineness, the Character, the Purpose, the Worth, the Composition, and the History of the Interpretation of the Parables. The second volume will contain the explanation of the individual parables.

The author's stand-point is rationalizing, and his acquaintance with the literature of the subject is not always what could be wished.

In speaking of the genuineness of the narratives which contain the parables, he says: "I am convinced, with the great majority of contemporary writers, that the oldest of the Gospels was composed soon after the year 70,

¹ *Die Gleichnissreden Jesu*, von Dr. A. Jülicher, Prediger in Rummelsburg. Erste Hälfte, Allgemeiner Theil. Freiburg, I. B., 1886.

Matthew and Mark not much later." The author, when using the words "contemporary writers," must have his eye chiefly on those German scholars who belong to the radical school. It is by no means true that the great majority of New Testament critics hold the view in question. On the contrary, the majority, if we allow ourselves to look over the entire field, is decidedly the other way. Dr. Jülicher holds that the kernel of the parables is genuine in almost every case, but that no one can longer defend their absolute genuineness. Many of them are preserved in a very corrupt state, and, without careful examination, the voice of Jesus cannot be recognized among the voices of the Evangelists.

According to his judgment, the writers of the Gospels had a wrong idea of the meaning of the parable, in so far as they held it to signify a veiled thought, and a wrong idea also of the aim of the parable, for they understood that Jesus wished thereby to conceal His teaching from the masses.

The author divides the parables into three classes. Two of these are freely invented parables, one class consists of narratives from life. The aim of the parable is to make truth vivid in order to win men thereby. The author sets a high value on the parables, and thinks that in them we look most deeply into the heart of the Lord. "These parables convince, they capture the imagination, they move the heart, they disarm or arm the will. The Master went to school to no one, neither did He steal any one's colors or brush. The originality, the variety, the simplicity, the naturalness, the admirable form of the parables are fascinating."

The author thinks that the original parables were modi-

fied chiefly in two ways before they became fixed in our Gospels. On the one hand, they were amplified, as in Mark; on the other, they were obscured by allegorizing additions, as in Matthew.

According to Tamm,¹ the aim of Jesus in His parables was to make spiritual truth appeal to men from a new point of view. Abstract truths are planted in the soil of reality. The parable seems to look away from the one who is really addressed, and to speak of a third person. It leads the individual out of himself, beyond himself, makes him the spokesman for his kind. There was no thought in the mind of Jesus of concealing the truth of His kingdom in His parables. Rather do the parables stand as eternal monuments of a love which did not come to judge and condemn, but to seek and to save what was lost. And if many of these parables wish to bring judgment upon the erring, it takes place in the sense of I. Cor. xi. 31: "If we judged ourselves, we should not be judged." Tamm divides the parables into two classes, the fictitious and the non-fictitious. The former are special in character, the latter general. The fictitious parables do not present impossible persons and events, but such as might be met with any day in real life.

We have a brief monograph on the much discussed passages in I. Peter by Dr. Usteri.² The leading thought of the digression in verses 18-22 is the Messianic deliverance, which is conditioned on the suffering, the quickening, and the glorification of the Messiah. Its

¹ *Der Realismus Jesu in seinen Gleichnissreden.* Von H. Ch. Tamm. Jena, 1886.

² "*Hinabgefahren zur Hölle.*" Eine Wiedererwägung der Schriftstellen, I. Pet. iii. 18-22 und iv. 6. Von Joh. Martin Usteri. Zürich, 1886.

instrument is baptism. It is not in keeping with this view to understand the preaching of Christ *ἐν πνεύματι* as a preaching of the *λόγος* not yet incarnate, thus springing back hundreds of years without a syllable of explanation, but this general thought does harmonize with the conception of Christ's descent into Hades as a part of His historic work of redemption. In reply to the objection that there is no reason why the antediluvians should receive such special favor, the author calls attention to the fact that the period of the Flood was not a period of grace, as was that of the Old Covenant.

In the special exegesis Usteri inclines to the view that *ἐν πνεύματι* refers to the Holy Spirit as the principle of quickening, and regards the dative as instrumental. He holds with many others, in opposition to the scholars of the Reformation, that the spirits of verse 19 are the spirits of unbelievers. He regards *σώζει* as parallel to *διδασκάζειν*, and as denoting deliverance in the Messianic judgment. He argues that the thought in iv. 6 is independent of that in iii. 19. The subject, predicate, and object are different from those of the earlier passage. As to the dogmatic importance of iii. 19, the author takes conservative ground. He finds no other clear allusion in the New Testament to a descent of Christ into Hades. The passage in Peter is a "unicum." It should therefore be used with utmost care in formulating any statement of doctrine.¹

¹ See Dr. Gloag in *Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*, p. 202.

For a discussion of II. Thess. ii. 6-7, see the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1887, viertes Heft.

τὸ κατ' ἔχον is referred to the leaven of the Gospel, and *ὁ κατ' ἔχον* refers to Christ. The removal of this power "out of the midst" refers to the "dynamic cessation" of Christ's influence.

HISTORIC THEOLOGY.

THE MOST RECENT STUDIES IN
CHURCH HISTORY,
WITH SOME OF THE MORE IMPORTANT RESULTS.

BY

REV. HUGH M. SCOTT,
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

HISTORIC THEOLOGY.

INTRODUCTION.

HISTORIC METHODS AND DIVISION.

SPEAKING of the unity of history, Stubbs points out¹ how there is "scarcely a single movement now visible in the current of modern affairs but can be traced back with some distinctness to its origin in the early Middle Ages." This continuity is felt by the general student of history, but is fully appreciated, he says, only by the church historian, for "it is Christianity that gives to the modern world its living unity, and at the same time cuts it off from the death of the past." The order of historic progress is moral and not physical. We must work from the past forwards, not backwards from the present; and, pursuing this course of events, we can see that success is certain to the pure and true, while success to falsehood and wrong is but the prelude to an irremediable fall. In common with natural science, Stubbs sees in the study of living history "a gradual approximation to a consciousness that we are growing into a perception of the workings of the Almighty Ruler of the world; that we are growing able to justify the Eternal Wisdom, and by that justification to approve

¹ Cf. *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Mediæval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects*. Oxford, 1886, 10 sh.

ourselves his children." But this unity of history, he holds, must not be applied to reject new points of departure in human history, for modern life is not a continuation of mediæval history by a continuity and unity at all points equally important. Only in church history is this unity realized on a great and intelligible scale, and even there the unity is to some extent a unity of ideas, of religious and moral motive, and not merely of historic continuity.

The difference between the radical and conservative schools of history has been sharply set forth by Lilly¹ in a study of the Middle Ages from a Roman Catholic point of view. The materialistic-evolutionary school, he says, hold, with Littré, that "history is a natural phenomenon, where the antecedent produces the consequent." This makes the annals of the world a mere record of mechanism and fatality, and saints and heroes but puppets in the game played by natural selection. The other school believes, with Augustine, that *Dei voluntas est rerum natura*, and the history of mankind is under the moral government of God. Lilly goes farther, and sees in Gregory VII. a mouth-piece of divine will and law opposing the new world order of the Middle Ages, the feudal system of force with the emperor at its head. He sees here the conflict between Christ and Cæsar, and says that other historians, like Gardiner, believe in the same God in history, but speak of Him as "that stream of European progress of which the impelling force was Protestantism." Lilly illustrates his theory also by reference to the Jesuits of the sixteenth century. They did much that was wrong,

¹ *Chapters in European History*, London, 1886; and *The Renaissance and the Jesuits* in *The English Historical Review*, January, 1887.

he admits, but their spirit and aim was to fight the growing absolutism of secular powers, and to exalt the liberty and rights of conscience as they understood them. This point, he urges, has been too much ignored or denied by such writers as Pater and Symonds.¹

The modern objective method of historic research and presentation, as set forth by Ranke, has been recently summed up by Von Sybel.² Its fundamental principle is familiar and self-evident when uttered; it is that every narrator of an event describes not the event itself, but the impression which he received of it. In his statements there is thus blended a subjective element, which it is the work of historic criticism to separate, in order to reach the actual facts in the case. When two or three or more narrators have got their information from predecessors, the critical analysis to reach the original source becomes the more difficult.

Besides this critical analysis there must be also the exercise of a presentative imagination, a productive artistic sense, which can re-create and animate the facts and relations found by criticism.

The school of Ranke, as a rule, reject all legend as worthless for the historian, but Görres maintains³ that some legends give valuable historical material independent of their mythical contents. He illustrates from such cases as Miro, King of the Spanish Suevi. The legend relates that, going to pray at the shrine of St. Martin of

¹ Cf. Symonds, *The Renaissance in Italy ; the Catholic Reaction*, 2 vols., London, 1887, \$7.

² *Gedächtnissrede auf Leopold von Ranke*, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1886, H. 6.

³ Cf. *Die historische Kritik und die Legende*, in *Hist. Ztft.*, 1887, H. 2.

Tours, he forbade his court page and jester to pluck the grapes growing about the atrium devoted to the saint. The boy disobeyed, whereupon his outstretched arm grew stiff, and the enraged king, seeing him on his return, ordered the arm cut off. The lad's comrades then quoted "Judge not that ye be not judged," when Miro burst into tears, and while he prayed the page was cured. The miraculous in this account is, of course, legend, but the following points are shown from other sources to be fully historic; the fact that Miro kept a court jester, the king's belief in the miraculous power of Martin, and the tendency to sudden anger and quick repentance in the ruler. Gregory of Tours got his information, miracles and all, from a man who lived at the court of Miro, and heard the story from the king himself.

The arrangement of historic material and its distribution will vary greatly according to the particular element in it which the historian wishes to make prominent. Freeman divides European History¹ according to its relation to the great center, Rome, into Europe before the growth of Rome, Europe with Rome, and Europe since Rome has practically ceased to be. He says that the central position and permanent influence of Rome, "the Eternal City," is "the groundwork of all sound historic teaching." The present state of things, "a Romeless world," is very similar to the very early period before Rome appeared. "In both alike the European world lacks a center." The chief difference is that then the unit of disjointed Europe was the city, and now it is the nation. Rome came and ruled, and ceased to be, but a

The Chief Periods of European History, London, 1886, 10 sh.

problem older than Rome has survived her fall; it is "the Eternal Eastern Question," "the undying question between the civilization of the West and the barbarism of the East, a question which has here and there taken into its company such side issues as the strife between freedom and bondage, between Christendom and Islam, but which is in its essence simply that yet older strife of whose earlier stages Herodotus so well grasped the meaning." From Achilles to Skobelev the warriors change, but the field of battle is the same.

This conflict has laid, Freeman says, two abiding duties upon Aryan Europe: to develop the common institutions of the great family within its borders, and to defend those borders and those institutions against the inroads of barbarians from without. The history of Europe before the Roman power is the history of the stages by which the Greek mind made its way to general supremacy over the civilized world. Then Rome came to the throne to be the champion of Europe against barbarian inroads. Reaching complete dominion, she became Christian, and entered upon her mission for the world. "That Christianity should become the religion of the Roman Empire is the miracle of history; but that it did so become is the leading fact of all history from that day onwards." "Christianity has never been the creed of any great power beyond the European world." The popes succeeded to the power of Rome, for "in the eyes of history the power of the Roman Church grew up simply because it was the Roman Church, and the church of no meaner city." Rome spoke through her pope because she had no emperor; there was no Papacy in the East, for here the

emperor remained *Pontifex Maximus*. Romeless Europe shows us a Roman Church becoming national like the nations, and falling back on the times when it was a local church. The Popes have now ceased to be European; they are all Italians.

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY CHURCH.

I. RISE AND SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

CRITICS are still discussing whether the Gospel can stand and men live by it without a historic Christ as its origin. Some Dutch divines hold that a class of timid men will leave the free theology and join the evangelical ranks; but the rest will deliver their belief from every historic support, and, if need be, sadly surrender the illusion of a personal Jesus, although they think that would bring no injury to their life of faith.¹ With the historic Christ would fall Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Christian festivals. Some speak of the era of the Spirit as now beginning, the Age of Symbolic Religion, succeeding that of the Father in the Old Testament and that of the Son in Historic Christianity. Others object that the ideal Christ and the personal Jesus will disappear together. Loman replies that we cannot tell what the Christianity of the first century was; we must have either an ideal Christianity of some form or none at all. Jesus-worship he pronounces absurd, for Jesus cannot be historically found; we know just about nothing about him. Kuenen and Scholten oppose such views, and Van der Bergh asks, "How is it to be explained that the heathen did not accept a royal theocratic Messiah from the Jews, but received the

¹ Cf. Van Manen, *Zur Literaturgeschichte der Kritik und Exegese des Neuen Testaments*, in *Jahrbücher f. Protest. Theologie*, 1886, H. 3.

suffering Servant of Jehovah, if the cross was no reality, but a mere symbol?" Loman now modifies his theory, and admits that historic criticism may find a real Jesus of Nazareth in the Gospels; but he was a pupil of John the Baptist, a Jewish zealot, who fanatically purified the temple, and died a martyr demagogue under Pilate. Christianity was, accordingly, at first Jewish and opposed to Rome, as can be seen in Papias and Hegesippus.

The universal ideal of humanity, which presents Jesus in the Gospels as a great moral teacher, above all political and national limits, hating zealotism and preaching patience as a virtue, that came from an entirely different source. These two views found in the Gospels cannot be harmonized; both cannot be historical. The Jesus of history is a Jewish zealot; the Christ of the Church is a growth from prophetic ideals and from views borrowed from Roman world-dominion and Greek philosophy. He is a fictitious personality embodying symbolic teaching. Scholten's reply to this shows that the picture is not true: the historic Christ did not hate heathen; he was more than a follower of John the Baptist; and his disciples readily accepted him as the Messiah.

Similar destructive methods have been applied to the Apostle Paul. We have been accustomed for a generation to "Paul of the Acts" and "Paul of the Chief Epistles," the one being a fiction of the second century, according to the critics, and the other the genuine Apostle to the Gentiles. Occasionally, also, we have heard of a "Pseudo-Paul of the Minor Epistles."¹ But now Loman leads us up to the distinction between "Paulus

¹ Cf. Van Manen, *Paulus Episcopus*, in *Jahrbb. f. Prot. Theologie*, 1887, II. 3.

Historicus" and "Paulus Canonicus." The first of these is genuine, though the little historic information known about him is found in the Acts, none of his so-called Epistles being his work, but a product of the second century portraying a Canonic Paul in the colors of that age.

Last of all, Professors Pierson and Naber, of Amsterdam, have discovered another Paul, whose full name is "Paulus Episcopus." And he is a wonderful man, as set forth in their *Verisimilia*.¹ These critics find little certain about when or where he lived, or what he did. They are sure, however, that he was a bishop, and while he wrote nothing himself, he put together the writings of others, and edited them. He got the rich material in the Epistles that bear his name from the *pneumatici*, a select class of spiritually-minded Jews, who were, in a sense, forerunners of the Christian Church. In their dreamful souls, the vision of a Messiah became a historic reality. Among them the myth cycle was soon completed, and then they wrote those Epistles, which Paul took and edited for the Thessalonians or Corinthians to suit the local circumstances. These critics end their research with the words, "We do not know the first beginning of the Christian religion;" and in this most readers will agree with them, for of Paul the Bishop, and the Jewish *pneumatici*, history knows nothing, while respecting these wonderful letters among the Jews, and their working-over to edify the Christians, no proof of their hypothetical existence is given, save the oft recurring phrase, "We are of the opinion."

The most important work of the past year on the Apos-

¹ Amsterdam, 1886.

tolie Church ¹ leads us into a similar region of subjectivity and visions.

Weizsäcker explains the miracles, which he cannot otherwise render intelligible, as subtle spiritual analogies, composed by the Apostles themselves in order to make Jesus the object of their teaching. The paradoxes, the anecdotes, the parables of Christ, are made historic events, in order to symbolically set forth the character of their Master. This transition from the wonderful things said by the Lord to the wonderful things done by Him can be explained, Weizsäcker says, by the fact that gradually Christ's person and not his teaching became the object of faith, and that instruction rested not upon history but upon a symbolic presentation of the being of the Saviour. The Evangelists, he holds, were conscious that they were speaking allegorically in such cases, hence we find the miraculous cursing of the fig-tree given by Luke as the parable of the fig-tree. Everywhere in the New Testament this "pious fraud" may be traced, as, for example, in the Gospel of John, where the historic arrangement is transformed into a haggadic piece of teaching.

The crucial case of the resurrection is a fair illustration of how the gentler modern rationalism deals with supposed facts of Apostolic days. Our author finds the New Testament accounts of this event so contradictory that any exact knowledge of what happened is impossible. Our only real historic source is Paul, and he gives us no exact information. All we can say is that these witnesses experienced a moment which filled them with the cer-

¹ Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*. Freiburg, I. B., 1886, M. 14.

tainty that Jesus lived and was with them. What is said of the twelve, the five hundred, the great number who saw the risen Christ, proves only that this pneumatic vision, like other operations of strong religious excitement, may come in common to a number of persons, and that, under certain conditions, it is communicable.

Paul might be called "Creator of a Church." He was also, in an important sense, the founder of Christian theology, for he gave the Gospel universal application, freed it from the law, and brought all the sides of human life into connection with Christ.¹ His central doctrine was justification by faith; and yet, strange to say, this doctrine early disappeared from the school of Paul, although his influence was strong enough to overthrow Jewish legalism in the Church, and keep alive the thought of a new spiritual life of loving obedience to moral order. Paul's universal Gospel, however, as Weizsäcker rightly remarks, was not such a new thing as some radical critics have made it, in contrast with the teaching of Peter or James. The Church in Rome had the doctrine of a Christian monotheism for all men: this idea came to them partly through the instruction given proselytes, by which Jew and Gentile met to worship Jehovah, and was independent of Paul's views. Barnabas, too, preached the same Gospel for all men: so did Apollos, and neither was pupil of Paul. The heathen proselytes, so numerous in all great cities, formed a fruitful field for this free Gospel, which made all men brethren in Christ. Even Roman moralists were feeling after the truth of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. From the time of Jerome until the period

¹ For a good short account of the critical estimate of St. Paul, cf. Courdaveaux, *S. Paul d'après la libre critique en France*. Paris, 1886, fr. 2.

of the Humanists, Seneca was regarded as a Christian, so striking was the similarity between some utterances of his and those of the New Testament. The question has been much debated, Kreyer, the latest critic, coming to the conclusion¹ that Seneca was acquainted with Christians, especially with Paul. He says that the philosopher opposed persecution, and even himself had Christians among his slaves. The echoes of Bible thought increase in the later works of Seneca. He supposes that *ὁ κατέχων*, II. Thess. ii. 2, refers to friendly interference in behalf of the Church, and that Seneca is the Roman called by the Greek name Theophilus in the writings of Luke! Whether these details be true or not, recent investigation is turning more from negation and contrast between the ancient faiths and the Christianity which took their place, and is laying more stress upon the unity and solidarity in human life and history, upon the great needs and hopes which were common to men while heathen, and which they carried with them into the fuller light and peace of the Gospel. Pressensé finds in the Pagan religions everywhere foregleams of monotheism, and wishes and yearnings which look towards important doctrines of Christianity.²

Of the Apostle Peter recent criticism rather diminishes than increases our knowledge. Lipsius finds in the Acts of Peter and Paul³ two forms of the legend that Peter and Paul were in Rome; the one is Gnostic and Ebionitic, the other Catholic. The first separates the Apostles in

¹ *L. Annæus Seneca u. seine Beziehungen zum Urchristentum*, Berlin, 1887, M. 5.

² Cf. his *Histoire des trois premiers Siècles de l'Église chrétienne*, I. Ser. *L'Ancien monde et le Christianisme*, Paris, 1887.

³ *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 2 Bd. I. Hälfte, Braunschweig, 1887, M. 16.

life, in teachings, and in their martyr death. The second is an apologetic work, opposing any difference between Peter and Paul, and making them work in company in Rome and die together. The tradition, reflected in the Clementines, which sets the Apostles in conflict, Simon Peter following the false teacher Simon Magus (Paul) from land to land, Lipsius finds to be older than the other, which depicts the harmony of Jewish and Gentile Christians by the full agreement of the two Apostles. The later tradition, in fact, is a working-over of the earlier Ebionite story; and all that we know of Peter's activity in Rome comes from this fictitious source. But what of the accounts of Simon Magus and of St. Peter in early writers, such as Justin Martyr? Lipsius replies: they all came from the Ebionite tradition. Peter did not go to Rome with Paul; he did not found the Church there with him; he was, in short, never in Rome at all. The basis of the whole story was, "the journey of Paul to Rome, upon which the twofold tradition of a friendly or hostile meeting of the two Apostles in Rome has been built." This is a very sweeping conclusion, and there seems some reason to doubt whether Lipsius has made good his position that all that we know about Peter in Rome or of Simon Magus must be limited to what was found in an apocryphal book of the obscure sect of Ebionites.¹

A similar double legend, relating to Spyridion, a Cyprian bishop and member of the Council of Nice, has recently been discovered in an unpublished life of the

¹ Cf., further, *Würzburger Lateinische Handsschrift zu den Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, von Schepss, in *Zft. f. Kirchengeschichte*, 1886, H. 3; and Thenn, *Vite omnium XIII. Apostolorum item XIII. Patrum Apostolicorum*, in *Zft. f. wissent. Theologie*, 1886, H. 4.

saint, by Theodorus, Bishop of Paphos.¹ The biographer carefully separates his written and oral sources. He gives an appendix containing extracts from Socrates the historian, the account of John, a monk from his own monastery, and the reports of an old man, who told him about the saint at his festival in 655. But for the life of Spyridion he follows chiefly a popular story in iambic verse, which was the source of the whole tradition, though he rejects the view that it was written by Triphyllios, a pupil of the saint himself. The monk John told Theodorus that he was in Alexandria in 639, when the Arabs came, and the story was that the patriarch and bishops of the fourth century once met and prayed that the idols in the city might fall ; but their prayers were not answered. Then, in a vision, the Lord directed the patriarch to send for Spyridion, whose supplications should prevail. The saint was called, his prayer was answered, and all the idols of Alexandria fell to rise no more. At the next festival in the cathedral of Spyridion, Theodorus read to the people the new life of the saint, when objections were at once raised to the Alexandrian incident, of which the iambic poem knew nothing. Investigation showed that it was an old tradition, for it was found that the ancient wall paintings in the church, setting forth the life of Spyridion, contained, though long ignored and misunderstood, the scene of the Alexandrian tradition. It thus appears that very early two legendary lives of the saint were in circulation, the one represented by the Alexandrian legend and the picture, the other by the iambic poem.

The story of St. Cæcilia, the virgin martyr, runs like a

¹ Cf. Usener, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Legendenliteratur*, in *Jahrbb. f. Prot. Theologie*, 1887, H. 2.

golden thread through the art, poetry, and tradition of the early Roman Church. Especially since De Rossi showed the close connection of her burial-chamber in the Catacombs with those of the early Roman bishops, the story of her life has received fresh historic interest. The *Martyr Acts*, which tell of her sufferings in the time of Bishop Urbanus, are now shown by Erbes¹ to have arisen not earlier than A.D. 494. The church of St. Cæcilia appears for the first time with such a name at the Synod of Symmachus, 499, and she was not known as a church saint before that date. There is, however, a historic element in these apocryphal *Acts*. Cæcilia is said to have died when Urbanus was bishop, in the reign of Alexander Severus. But this emperor did not persecute the church. Just here Erbes gets help from the Catacombs. The *Acts* say Urban buried Cæcilia *inter collegas suos*, that is, in or near the Pope-Crypts, found by De Rossi on the Appian Way, and just where an inscription shows she was buried, apparently early in the third century, though not yet honored as a saint.

Callistus was honored as a martyr because of his confession and banishment; and this honor of martyrdom the writer of the *Acts* took for martyrdom by death, and put a persecution in the time of Alexander Severus. Cæcilia died probably under Septimius Severus. The name of Urban is put in this early period because that name clung to the church in Transtevere, later consecrated to St. Cæcilia; so Urban and Cæcilia are put in personal relations by the *Acts*.

This clue leads Erbes to look for the origin of this

¹ *Die heilige Cäcilia im Zusammenhang mit der Papst-crypta sowie der ältesten Kirche Roms*, in *Zft. f. Kirchengeschichte*, 1887, H. 1.

church in the time of Urban (222–230), under Alexander Severus. Of that monarch we know the story, how, when wine merchants disputed with Christians about a certain place, he said: “It is better that any god be worshipped there than that it be given to wine-sellers.” This competition between Christians, with their church, and liquor dealers, with their shop, Erbes finds to have occurred in the time of Urban, to whom also the church, later called after St. Cæcilia, was transferred; and, still more wonderful, these churches were one and the same. The Christians occupied one of the *Conventicula*, built by Nero, and still standing; while the renters of the *cauponæ*, or wine-shops, near by, also a work of Nero, finding the crowds of Christians who came thither unprofitable customers, wished to drive this early camp-meeting away from the saloon neighborhood by claiming their place of meeting. The sanctuary, thus saved to a temperance church by one of the noblest emperors, was dedicated to the virgin martyr Cæcilia about A.D. 460.

The early church honored true confessors and sufferers for Christ, but opposed, in word and deed, more than is usually supposed, paying respect to heretics and pseudo-saints. Arians died as martyrs, and some of their names occur in the lists of saints of both the Greek and Latin churches; but, as Görres shows, they were at first smuggled in.¹ With the exception of Agapetus, the heretical saints now in the Roman Calendar were utterly unknown as martyrs or saints in the Eastern Church before the tenth century. It was the corrupt Byzantine tradition of the eleventh century that introduced them regardless of

¹ *Arianer im officiellen Martyrologium der römischen Kirche*, in *Zft. f. wiss. Theologie*, 1887, II. 2.

time or character. They were unknown in the West till the sixteenth century, when Baronius blindly put them in the Latin list. Some of these Arian saints are Agapetus of Synnada, Auxentius of Mopsuestia, who suffered under Licinius, and Artemius, who was a pseudo-martyr, a Semi-Arian, who died under Julian, for his crimes and not for his faith. Even a persecutor of the Orthodox Church has been put by Baronius among the saints!

The days of the martyrs have always been regarded as times of peculiar trial, and the persecuted Church has ever been a favorite field of study;¹ but the age that began with Constantine was no less truly a time of peril, and should have received more careful study than has hitherto been bestowed upon it. Schultze begins his investigations into the decline and fall of Heathenism in the Roman Empire² with a brief estimate of the strength of the Church when it joined hands with the State to overthrow Paganism. He finds two hundred bishops and one hundred thousand Christians in North Africa early in the third century, or about two per cent. of the people. In Spain, in A.D. 300, there were probably fifty thousand believers. Italy came next to Africa: in Rome there were twenty different Christian burial-places, A.D. 300; and the Christians numbered one hundred thousand, or nearly one-seventh of the citizens. In the rest of Italy, he estimates, there were one hundred thousand more Christians.

¹ Cf. Allard, *Histoire des persécutions pendant la première moitié du troisième siècle*. Vol. ii., Paris, 1886. He tells of the sufferings under Septimius Severus, Maximinus, and Decius.

² *Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*. B. I., Staat u. Kirche im Kampfe mit dem Heidentum. Jena, H. Costenoble, 1887, M. 6.

By the close of the fourth century, Stokes supposes, Christianity prevailed universally among the British Celts.¹ The Saxons found the native Britons all Christians, and in fraternal relations with their brethren in Gaul. Public roads, commerce, and the Roman army spread the Gospel rapidly. We have learned recently of British troops in Pamphylia, and an "inscription in the language of Palmyra" was found lately in England, showing how Rome must have spread ideas by her army system. In 343, the Irish invaded Britain and set up a king, Crimthann, there, from 360 to 370, so that the Gospel, known in England, must have reached many Irish before the days of Patrick.

In Asia Minor, as Schultze points out, the churches were numerous and well organized; hence the wide spread of Gnosticism and Montanism. Here the Gospel was not opposed by barbarism, as in the West, and could move swiftly along the lines of ancient culture. There were, very likely, a million Christians in Asia Minor by A.D. 300, west of a line drawn from Issus to Sinope. Egypt contained about one hundred and fifty thousand believers, of whom fifty thousand were in Alexandria. This land was more thoroughly Christianized than is usually supposed. Beyond the Greek Church here, past Alexandria, with Origen and Athanasius, we are beginning to see the venerable Egyptian heathenism which the new faith was to supplant. We are hearing of wonderful pagan hymns in which God is conceived "under two aspects, the Father and the Son;" but we are reading also of peaceful victory in the inscriptions *ὁ σιαυρός ἐνίκησεν* and

¹ *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, A History of Ireland from St. Patrick to the English Conquest in 1172. London, 1886, 7 sh. 6. The best brief history of the early Irish Church.

δῆι νικᾶν — “Conquer we must” — found upon a temple of Isis at Philæ, which became a church of St. Stephen.¹ All along the Nile, temples of Ptolemy Philopator, Thothmes II., III., Isis Hathor, and Ramses III. were turned Christian churches.²

In the whole empire, under Constantine, there were at least ten million Christians; Schultze is even inclined to accept the estimate of Keim, who puts the number at sixteen millions. Such multitudes of men of conviction, well organized in churches, and forming a great brotherhood throughout the ancient world, with the first Christian emperor at their head, might well expect to convert the empire, and restore unto it glory and honor. But the course of events bore Rome downwards towards decay and ruin. Christians were disinclined to serve as soldiers to defend the frontier. Not a few of them fled to the deserts and became idle anchorites or monks. The Goth and the Vandal hung upon the borders and threatened death and dishonor; while heathen philosophers pointed to the impending destruction as the vengeance of the dishonored gods. Augustine replied to these attacks, that present evils were but a reflux wave in the great stream of God's purpose, which flows ever towards its goal. A recent writer carries out the same thought, and shows progress in all national relations, even in those darkest days when Christianity was spreading over Germany.³

¹ Cf. *Egyptian Christianity*, in *The Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1887.

² Cf. Hyvernât, *Les Actes des Martyrs de l'Égypte*. Texte Copte et Traduction Française, Paris, 1886: the first three parts of what will be the most complete collection of Coptic Martyrdoms; also, Amélineau, *Le Christianisme chez les anciens Coptes*, in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1887, T. XV., N. I.

³ Cf. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, I. Thl. Bis zum Tode des Bonifatius. Leipzig, 1887, M. 10.

The breaking-up of the old system of things was a preparation for the seed of the Kingdom of God. The colossal frame-work of Rome fell, that the young nations might now begin a new development, and begin it Christian. Through the rents of the imperial power we see Greek slaves working for a Roman officer on the Rhine, Syrian merchants travelling to France and Belgium, Italian workmen bringing their skill and their religion into the far north lands. The churches that arose in Roman Germany, however, were blotted out by the wandering of the nations; the Christians in France were Roman, so that, Hauck says, the Church History of Germany begins with Clovis. His famous battle against the Alemanni is put by Vogler¹ in the year 506 and not 496 A.D. He holds, further, that his conversion has been put in too close connection with the battle to make the parallel closer with that of Constantine. He became a Christian chiefly through the influence of the queen, aided largely by political considerations, looking to future increase of power, and in a lesser measure by gratitude for his victory. He formed a league with the orthodox emperor of the East against Theoderich the Arian, in the West, and sealed the treaty by baptism, Christmas, 506.

II. HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

The teaching of the *Shepherd of Hermas* respecting the person and work of Christ has been summed up by Link as follows:² The Son of God, who is regarded as identical with the Holy Ghost, and who was already active at

¹ *Chlodwig's Sieg über die Alamannen u. seine Taufe*, in *Hist. Zft.*, 1886, H. 6.

² *Christi Person u. Werk im Hirten des Hermas*, Marburg, 1886, M. 1.20.

creation, has taken up his abode in Jesus and wrought redemption. But since Jesus served the Spirit in a sinless life, God has exalted him to fellowship with himself and the Holy Ghost. He has also taken his place at the head of the archangels, being in his position as Redeemer sharply distinguished from them, though according to his nature the same with them. From the beginning, God gave mankind into the hands of his Son, the Holy Ghost. The Son prepared for redemption by putting all men under the care of the angels, and then Himself became flesh, delivered his people from sin, and, by giving them the law, enabled them to gain salvation. The reward of Jesus is the highest which a man can receive; it is to stand at the head of all created things. In the last times, the Shepherd, sent by Jesus, will restore the degenerate Church to its former glory; the Son of God will receive the spotless people to Himself; then will God's plan of redemption be realized, and the Father resume the kingdom, which He had given for a time to the Son. Whether such teaching seems orthodox, as Dörner and Zahn hold, or heretical, in rejecting the pre-existent Son, as Baur taught, it betrays confusion in Christological doctrines, and shows a drifting, as do the writings of other Apostolic Fathers, toward a legalism in religion, which developed later into the errors of Catholicism. It is difficult to think of wide-spreading Christian legalism in the second century, when we remember the many Gentile churches in which we naturally suppose Paul's doctrines of grace were well known. But the Epistle of James suggests such a view of the Gospel as "perfect law;" the *Αἰδαχή* illustrates it afresh; the Apostolic Fathers show it further developed; and recent research

finds that Pauline theology was about lost to the early Church till revived by Augustine. This legal spirit in post-Apostolic teaching can be best seen by considering its estimate of the death of Christ.¹

The Epistle of Barnabas considers the sacrifice of Christ as a general offering for man's redemption; the idea of sacrifice common among the heathen is unconsciously applied to the death of Christ; and it is made a part of general worship, something appointed by God, through which salvation came. In baptism the benefit of the death of Christ blots out all past sins; future sins can be atoned for by good works. The explanation of Ritschl is accepted, "that the heathen believer was not in a position to understand and reproduce the significance of the death of Christ, as set forth by the Apostles on the ground of the Old Testament type of sacrifice," and so the pagan legal idea of sacrifice crept in. Polycarp and Ignatius represent the same tendency. Respecting "the life of the Christian after baptism, none of the Apostolic Fathers can find in the death of the Lord an objective saving basis upon which to rest forgiveness of sins." And yet the merely moral influence regarded in the offering of Christ had limits set to it, by the apprehension of a relation of the forgiven sinner to a gracious God, entered into by means of that sacrifice.

Pursuing the path of this Christian legalism of the second century, we are soon brought into the complicated relations between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, out of which the early Catholic Church arose. Two important

¹ Cf. Behm, *Das christliche Gesetzmässigkeit der apost. Väter*, in *Zft. f. kirchl. Wissen. u. k. Leben*, 1886, II. 6.

questions meet us : (1) What were the elements which gave rise to the Gentile, post-Apostolic Church, and (2) Did the spirit and influence of Jewish Christianity continue to mould the Catholic Church, which was taking shape in the second century ?

Baur held that the Jewish Christianity of the original Apostles and the Gentile Christianity of Paul met in conflict, and the early Catholic Church was a peaceful union of the tendencies. Ritschl distinguished between original Jewish Christianity and anti-Pauline Christianity ; the former could well work with Paul, while the latter, violent for a time, lost all influence in post-Apostolic days, but dragged down with it the original Jewish Christianity. Pauline teaching, too, lost its peculiarities ; and out of this demoralization the Catholic Church arose. This view is plausible, because it avoids the conflict with a powerful Jewish Christianity, which must be broken down by long struggles before the Universal Church could arise. Harnack follows Ritschl¹ in making Paulinism so like ordinary Jewish Christianity that it may well be classed with it. Neither had much influence upon the rising Catholic Church. Paul's teaching worked negatively in breaking down Jewish narrowness, but added positively only the idea of the universality of the Gospel. His doctrines, Harnack holds, cannot explain the later growth of the Church, for they rest upon a peculiar exposition of the Old Testament which made them unintelligible to Gentile believers. Hence most Christians held the Jewish, Old Testament views of Christianity, modified by a theoretical doctrine of the universality of the Gospel, which did not

¹ Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, vol. iv., 1886, p. 129 ff.

exclude practical particularism. Harnack thinks Jewish Christianity passed rapidly away; but Hilgenfeld maintains that the Jewish influence worked upon the early Catholic Church by means of its Jewish Christian Churches and their missionaries.¹ Early Christianity was, for the most part, of the original Apostolic stamp, which was active not only at first among Jewish Christians, but also upon post-Apostolic development. Against Harnack, who thinks Jewish Christianity was supplanted swiftly by Gentile Christianity, he holds that no reason can be given why the one should yield to the other without a struggle.² Both admit that in the second century the majority of Christians were of the original Apostolic sort, not a few even holding to the first Apostles against Paul; but while Hilgenfeld urges that this proves post-Apostolic Gentile Christianity to have been of this original kind, and not Pauline, — Paul's views coming first to universal recognition in the Catholic Church, — Harnack follows Ritschl, and calls the prominence given the original Apostles in the second century a fiction, an *a priori* construction of Gentile Christianity, framed because the churches wished to think they still followed the Apostles! He makes the system which prevailed anti-Jewish as well as Hellenistic. The Church fell out of the framework of Judaism and took shape according to the thoughts of the Greeks. This change brought a view of the Gospel which, Harnack says, was opposed to the teaching of Christ. So the Church developed, first Jewish, then Hellenistic, finally Catholic. Where Hilgenfeld puts

¹ *Judenthum und Judenchristenthum*, Leipzig, 1886, M. 2.40.

² Cf. *Das Urchristenthum u. seine neueste Bearbeitungen*, in *Zft. f. wissen. Theologie*, 1886, H. 4.

Ebionites in this conflict of views, Harnack puts Hellenism, and says :

“ There is every reason to believe that Christian congregations, free from the law, were formed in the Empire out of societies of Jewish proselytes, without ever first considering the question, which had been discussed by Paul and his opponents. They were free from the law from the outset ; but they now got the conviction that their position, compared with that of the strict Jewish party, was not subordinate, but rather much the higher. It is not to be denied, however, that side by side with this transformation, which stands in the midst of the movement, real Jewish Christianity also played a certain part in the second century, in some provinces of the Empire.”¹

Hilgenfeld, on the other side, lays stress upon Gentile Christianity according to the original Apostles, and Gentile Christianity according to Paul. The transition from the one to the other took place gradually, he says, during the great persecutions, amid Gnostic controversies, and in opposition to the narrowness of Jewish Christianity. The Gnostic movement, which led up to the Catholic faith, arose earlier than the second century ; Edmund Pfeleiderer gives reasons for tracing its thoughts back even to Heraclitus.² He finds in the Epistle to the Ephesians a polemic against gnosticising immoralities and the orgies of the ancient mysteries, with plays upon thoughts of the sage of Ephesus, while the Gospel of John, with its mystic tone and its trias of cardinal ideas, λόγος, ζωή, and φως,

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1886, Nr. 24.

² *Heraklitische Spuren auf theologischem, insbesondere altchristlichem Boden, in Jahrb. f. Prot. Theologie*, 1887, H. 2.

points to the "dark Heracleitus," who spoke of the *λόγος* and the *ζωή-πῦρ*. The idea of the *logos* has an especial historic importance, inasmuch as it helps fill up the gap which without it would have been made in religious-philosophical views between the pre-Christian and the Christian periods. Justin Martyr touches this point in a way most interesting, historically. He was not influenced by Gnosticism, neither was he controlled by some philosophical system that might adopt Scripture language; his apprehension of Christian doctrine was free and natural. His idea of the *logos* moves from the conception of an impersonal power into that of the divine hypostasis; and it is the broad outline into which every predicate of God is brought, by which He is represented as active in creation and redemption, and having a relation to the world and to man.¹ Other men were inspired, more or less, by the *logos*, but in Jesus the *logos* became incarnate; hence, in dignity he is above all angels, though of like being with them. He is the revealer of Divine mysteries as Angel and Apostle, and as the Son worthy of the same honor as the Father. He is above the Holy Ghost, but second to the Father; in fact, the Son is so prominent for Justin that he finds the mystery of Christian doctrine, not in the trinity, but rather in the thought that the *logos* dwelt in a crucified man, and that this man should have the second place after the eternal God. But he falters here, sometimes speaking of the *logos* and the Holy Spirit as identical, and again making the Son divine, and God. Such hesitancy was very natural, for the ideas connected with

¹ Cf. Paul, *Ueber die Logoslehre bei Justinus Martyr*, in *Jahrbb. f. Prot. Theologie*, 1886, II. 4.

logos as reason in man, as the divine mind in action, as the principle of the universe, were very diverse.

Philo was the forerunner of the Alexandrian school of theology, in making the *logos* the Son of God, the divine principle expressed in mediation between God and man, and in pouring the teaching of the Bible into a Greek system of philosophy. He makes keeping the law mean the worship of the *logos*; and this lower worship led up to the higher, the Spiritual worship of the Eternal One. Such teaching would very plainly prepare the way for the Christian preacher and the Gospel of John. Clement of Alexandria entered into this inheritance, and set forth Christ in the language of Plato. Others entered into the same inheritance, and reproduced the ideas of Platonism in the æons of Gnosticism. Bigg, in a recent study, traces early Greek theology as here indicated, from Plato, through Philo, and into Alexandrianism and Gnosticism. He does not think, with Harnack, that the Gnostics were the first Christian theologians, though he admits that such terms as *οὐσία*, *ἀπόστασις*, and *ὁμοούσιος* sprang from Gnosticism. "Between heathen Gnostics and the Gnostics known to Christian controversy there is no essential difference."¹ The time of Clement he characterizes as the first of those Pauline reactions which mark the critical epochs of theology; for, down to this period, he finds no trace of Paulinism, except among the Gnostics. Such reactions, however, he continues, have been along the line of Scripture, and not of speculation, of sin in man and grace in God, and not of Divine Goodness interpreted to teach

¹ Cf. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. The Bampton Lectures for 1886, Oxford, 1886, 10 sh. 6.

Universalism. All critics admit that a Biblical theology includes what is termed Paulinism, and in so far as Clement differs from Paul he is non-Biblical. Augustine's apprehension of sin and grace was intensely Biblical; and so Reuter has recently discovered that the most characteristic thing in that great theologian was his re-discovery of Paulinism, which he blended with current Catholicism.¹

The East led the way in developing theology and defining heresy; but the West was the first to put a man to death for wrong belief. We are promised new information respecting Priscillian of Spain, the first Christian who lost his life for heresy at the hands of Christians. Schepss has found in the university library of Würzburg a MS., marked "Homilies of an Unknown," written in uncials of the fifth and sixth century, which, he tells us, contains eleven treatises of Priscillian.² This ancient heretic is now able to speak for himself. In the first writing he defends himself from "the devilish slander of Itacius," and appeals to a "book of our brethren Tiberianus, Asarbus, and others, who are of one faith and one mind with us." These names are well known. Itacius was persecutor of the Priscillianists; Tiberianus suffered as a follower of Priscillian; and Asarbus died with Priscillian. The second treatise is addressed "to Bishop Damasus" of Rome, in which the writer speaks of a synod held in Saragossa, of the persecution which he suffered from Hydatius of Emerita, and of the falsehood spoken against him to Ambrose of Milan and the Emperor. The third treatise defends the reading of orthodox apoc-

¹ Cf. *Augustinische Studien*, Gotha, 1887, M. 10.

² Cf. *Priscillian, ein neu aufgefundener lateinischer Schriftsteller des 4. Jahrhunderts*. Vortrag. Würzburg, 1886, M. 1.50.

ryphal books. The others are of a homiletical nature. Schepss has not yet published this MS.; but it seems to be genuine, and may yield much new light. The editor tells us that Priscillian was accused of magic, and of offering first fruits to the sun and moon. He thought man's body a work of the devil; that is, he was charged with Manichæism. But Priscillian rejects Mani with horror. He says there were Manichæans in Spain, but he had nothing to do with them. He did not reject marriage and the eating of flesh. His statements, such as "Christ our God," show he was little influenced from such a source.

How much the bitterness of these doctrinal controversies was intensified by the Imperial influence, which was now entering the Church, is well shown by Krüger in his account of Lucifer of Calaris, and his fight for liberty and orthodoxy.¹ We see, further, from Krüger's book, that hitherto discipline had been exercised against heresy in life, or false, unworthy morals; now the tendency, seen in Novatianism and Donatism, is extended to separatist discipline in cases of heresy of doctrine. The holy Catholic Church had been divided by protests against unholy living; now it was rent by protests against unholy teaching.

A recent story of the influence of Augustine may properly be introduced at this point in our review, for in him the philosophical and theological thought of the period culminated.² Such study, too, is peculiarly valuable in

¹ Cf. *Lucifer Bischof von Calaris u. das Schisma der Luciferianer*, Leipzig, 1886, M. 2.40; and the critical edition of his works, *Luciferi Calaritani opuscula*, ed. Hartel, in *Corpus Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, Vol. xiv., Vienna, 1886, M. 9.

² Cf. Cunningham, *S. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought*, London, 1886, 12 sh. 6.

our day, for "the department of Christian life in which he was pre-eminent is one in which our age is singularly weak, and singularly blind to its own weakness." Augustine was a great theologian, and our age, according to Cunningham, while admiring religious sentiment and praising religious benevolence, pays little attention to the results of thought about God, and man's relation to Him. To know this great Father is to enter into the thoughts of the ages, and see the teachings which made Europe, Catholic and Protestant, what it is. He stood, "as the last spokesman of the wisdom of the ancient world," and "the first who discussed the characteristic problem of modern times." Plato held truth was in God; but Augustine taught that truth is God. The Divine is not only above all reason and all Being, but is the completest Reason, the highest Being. Neo-Platonism sank man in God; Augustine replied by exalting human personality, body and soul, as independent and active. He fought Manichæism as the last effort of Paganism to live by light borrowed from Christianity. He overthrew heathen ethical culture, and henceforth learning and morals became Christian.

Cunningham points out how modern science is confirming the stronger views of Augustine on evil in man. The great influence of heredity, now admitted, points far beyond corrupt society as the source of man's corruption. It is now generally recognized that children are born with dispositions which incline them, more or less, decidedly towards evil. Modern thought, too, in spite of heredity, demands that man be punished; and the argument of Augustine, that man acts voluntarily and is therefore responsible, is repeated in our day. Modern thought also

generally admits the hopelessness of finding a remedy for existing evils. Remedial punishment, national education, etc., it is admitted, all break down, and many drift into pessimism; all of which points towards the doctrine of Augustine, the growing and ineradicable power of sin.

The theology of the great African teacher prevailed more thoroughly in the Middle Ages than is usually supposed; and yet there ran parallel with it another tendency, a mystical, pantheistic type of doctrine, which colored mediæval thought, and found expression in the writings of pseudo Dionysius and his followers. We have heard of this movement in the West, but in a recent work Frothingham shows how much Syrian writers did to spread the same views.¹ Dionysius claimed that Hierotheos was his teacher, and that he but expounded his teacher's doctrine. Frothingham has just found in the British Museum a Syrian MS., entitled "*Book of the holy Hierotheos on the hidden mysteries of the Godhead*," which he promises soon to publish. This work he ascribes to Stephen Bar Sudaili, a Syrian monk and mystic, who lived about 500 A.D., and who wrote it under the pseudonym of Hierotheos. Sudaili, accordingly, was the teacher of Dionysius, and we are to see in the MS. before us the chief source of mediæval mysticism. An extract of the work is published; also, for the first time, two Syriac letters, with translation, which add to our knowledge of these early views. One is addressed to Sudaili, and opposes his theory of the finite duration of future punishment, giving also an outline of his pantheistic specula-

¹ Cf. *Stephen Bar Sudaili, the Syrian Mystic, and the book of Hierotheos*, Leyden, 1886.

tions. He wrote on the wall of his cell, "All nature is consubstantial with the Divine Essence," to which his correspondent objects, that that would make the incarnation superfluous.

Unity in Nature and unity in God were prominent ideas in Greek philosophy, and they assumed like prominence in Greek theology. From Monophysite to Monothelite the tendency was the same, unity in the person of Christ; as from Neo-Platonism to the mediæval mystics a similar drift is visible; oneness of man with God. The Nestorians led a reaction in Christology in favor of more emphasis upon the two natures in Christ. How their views appeared later, in opposition to Mohammedanism, Judaism, and the Orthodox Church, can be well seen in an *Apology of Elias of Nisibis*, a Nestorian archbishop (d. 1060), which is now published for the first time.¹ He defends the trinity from the charge of tritheism, by showing it is a trinity of attributes, not persons. These are (1) the Essence of God, (2) the Wisdom of God, and (3) the Life of God.²

He answers Jewish attacks upon the incarnation by showing that the Logos was united to Christ's humanity. The prophets all foretold the life of Jesus as it was; if he were a false Messiah, they certainly would have predicted such a terrible deceiver of Israel, his wonderful Church, etc.; but not a word is heard about such things.

¹ Cf. Horst, *Des Metropolitens Elias von Nisibis Buch vom Beweis der Wahrheit des Glaubens*, Colmar, 1886, M. 3.60.

² Cf., also, *The Apology of Al Kady*, with Introductory Essay, by Muir, 2d Ed. London, 1887, 2 sh. 6. A unique defence of Christianity against Islam, written A.D. 830, at the Court of the Caliph Al Mâmûn, in Mesopotamia.

Against the Greek Church he urges the *θεοτόκος* applied to Mary as the source of endless confusion. The Nestorians, he says, do not teach that Mary bore Christ only after his humanity; but they believe, that the union of the divine and human persons took place when the angel announced it to the Virgin; hence, they hold Mary bore Christ, but not God, for God is the trinity.

He says, in Bagarma, 163,000 Nestorians died as martyrs under Christian emperors.

III. CHURCH CONSTITUTION.

The first officials in the Early Church were the Apostles. What were the origin and nature of their position and activity? Lightfoot led the way recently in this inquiry, and was followed by others, the result being a general observation, that the limitation of the Apostleship to the twelve and the extinction of the office with their death went on parallel with the growth of the rising Episcopate. Here Seufert takes up the investigation,¹ and says the central question is, Had the original twelve Apostles, in the eyes of Paul and the church of the first fifty years, the same high place of honor which we are now accustomed to assign them? He answers that the Apostleship arose in Christ's desire to spread the Gospel of the Kingdom. It was not something new, for the name Apostle was familiar to both Jews and Gentiles; just as the terms presbyter and bishop were also in common use.

¹ *Der Ursprung u. die Bedeutung des Apostolats in der christlichen Kirche der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte.* Eine von der Haager Gesellschaft zur Vertheidigung der christl. Religion gekrönte Preisschrift, Leyden, 1887, M. 3; also, Withrow, *Were the Apostles Prelates?* in *The Presbyterian Review*, April, 1887.

Jesus himself appeared in the familiar place of a traveling Apostle, a preaching Evangelist, and is so described, Heb. iii. 1. The further question then arises, Did Jesus choose twelve of his own followers to be Apostles, and that when they were just beginning to learn that He was the Messiah? Seufert thinks not; he concludes that "the Apostolate is an institution of the Apostolic Church, which developed itself naturally from the spirit of the risen Christ, but was referred back in a very comprehensible way by the Scripture writers to the living Jesus." The appearance of Paul, c. A.D. 50, intensified the idea of the Apostolate and limited the number to twelve, according to Seufert, to exclude the new Apostle.

They must be eye-witnesses, orthodox, preservers of tradition, and foundations of the Church. So the Apostolate became an external institution as guardian of the faith in a reaction against Paul and the free Gospel, which he preached. This limitation of the office to eye-witnesses of Christ soon put an end to the first Apostolate, but prepared the greater honor, in succeeding generations, for the original twelve. The actual leadership of the Church passed into the hands of bishops and presbyters, who succeeded first to the place of the travelling Apostles, who continued in the Church after the twelve, and then claimed the prerogatives and powers of Peter, James, and John. The New Testament presents bishops and presbyters as still identical. But as early as the time of Ignatius, we find the bishops occupying a place of pre-eminence. How did this come to pass? Lightfoot accepted a modified form of the theory of Rothe, and put the rise of the episcopacy in A.D. 70-100. He found the cause to be the need of greater union among the churches, and concerted action

in view of such heresies as Gnosticism.¹ This transition took place, he thinks, under supervision of the Apostles, especially of St. John.

Hatch, as we have seen,² derives the term bishop from the treasurer of heathen religious societies, and holds it was transferred to the Church. The man who had charge of the alms, and gave thanks for the offerings in public worship, became in time the leading official. The presbyters, he thinks, came from the local sanhedrim connected with the synagogue; they were officers of discipline, not of instruction. In reference to the influences which converted a presbyter into a bishop, and made the bishop a ruler, Hatch follows Lightfoot in finding them in the need of a president, a chairman of the committee of management, a judge in controversy, and a depositary of sound doctrine.

Harnack has carried the investigation more into details, and finds that bishops and presbyters were distinct in origin, the one being almoner and thanksgiver, the other an officer of administration. At this stage of the inquiry the *Αἰδαχή* was discovered and the reply to the question, How could the bishop of the close of the second century, the leading person in worship, reach that high place of priestly privilege? has been found in chapter xv. of that writing, where we read, "Choose, therefore, for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men meek and not lovers of money, true and tried men, for they perform for you the service of prophets and teachers."

¹ Cf. my article *Recent Investigations into the Organization of the Apostolic and post-Apostolic Churches*, in *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, April and July, 1887; and Sanday, *The Origin of the Christian Ministry*, I. Recent Theories, in *The Expositor*, January, 1887.

² Cf. *Current Discussions*, vol. iv., 1886, p. 144 f.

Here Harnack finds the key to the mystery. The great respect paid to prophets and teachers, the first, the charismatic ministry of the Early Church, passed to the bishops and deacons, the officers of benevolence and discipline, who took their place. The primitive clergy were these prophets and teachers of special divine call; bishops and presbyters were not clergy, but executive officers of the local church; the transition took place by the local administrative officials taking to themselves the duties and honors of the original Evangelist, or Apostle, or Exhorter — and this transition is shown us for the first time in this passage of *The Teaching*. Harnack finds confirmation of this view in original documents of the second century, which he discovers in the Apostolic Canons.¹ Here bishops, presbyters, readers, deacons, and widows appear as the officers of the Church; from which it is argued that at first readers and exorcists were included under the charismatic ministry, and, hence, their duties were regarded as related to those of the teachers.

Against the general view of Hatch and Harnack, Sanday urges the following considerations:² It cannot be proven that bishops were permanent officers in ancient clubs; they were not treasurers; neither could this name be applied in the Christian sense to overseers of work, but rather to overseers of men. He regards the bishops rather as presbyters, afterwards appointed to take oversight of the deacons, the younger men; this would put bishops and deacons in that close connection in which they early

¹ *Die Quellen der sogenannten apostolischen Kirchenordnung nebst einer Untersuchung über den Ursprung des Lectorats u. der anderen niederen Weihen*, Leipzig, 1886, M. 4.

² Cf. *The Expositor*, February, 1887.

appear. The term bishop comes from the Old Testament, and not from heathen societies. He thinks the difference between bishop and presbyter, made by Harnack, is too great, and is opposed to Acts xx. 28, Titus i. 5-7, which make them identical. He admits, however, some difference between them in both name and origin. They arose on Jewish ground, the bishop being an elder, a man of experience; he was also a presbyter, in belonging to the smaller committee of elders who managed the affairs of the congregation. All bishops were presbyters in this sense, though not all presbyters were necessarily bishops. Harnack replies to this, that the term bishop is undoubtedly of Gentile Christian origin.¹

Sanday, on the other hand, heartily accepts the rise of the early episcopate by the transfer of honor and privileges from the first prophets and teachers to the bishops, presbyters, and deacons.

Harris urges afresh the point that Montanism was primitive Christianity, and the last attempt to retain the original prophets and the charismatic ministry.²

McPherson does not think that bishops and deacons took the place of prophets.³ He holds that teaching was always part of an elder's work. The presbyter and bishop were the same; only in respect of function was the presbyter called bishop or overseer. The New Testament, he says, knows but one ordination to office, and that is to the office of presbyter. In large churches, the bishop needed assistants, and they had the same ordination as the bishop; they became presbyters like himself. Thus there arose

¹ Cf. *The Expositor*, April, 1887.

² *Ibid.*, March, 1887.

³ *Ibid.*, April, 1887.

among the large number of presbyters in important churches two grades of presbyters, viz.: bishops and deacons. "Those in full authority were called bishops, and their assistants were called deacons." Outside of this elective office of presbyter, there was the extraordinary ministry of prophets and teachers. The fundamental unity between these two classes of leaders in the early Church, the charismatic and the local ministry, has been made prominent by Gore.¹ A prophet might settle in a church² and then he would be the supreme pastor or bishop. Here would be an important element in the formation of the later episcopate. James was such a "settled" prophet in Jerusalem. These men would not introduce a change of ministry, but would exercise the same ministry under changed circumstances. The relation of presbyters and deacons to the diocesan bishop, he says, was not fundamentally different from their earlier relation to the "apostolic men," or prophets, to Timothy or Titus when present.³

Another writer sums up the transition from the Congregational Episcopate to the Catholic Episcopate as follows: The dependence of office on mission; the hierarchical character of the various Church offices from the first — "first, Apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers," — the contrast between the general and the local ministry essentially temporary — the missionary or-

¹ *The Expositor*, June, 1887. ² Cf. *The Teaching*, c. xiii.

³ Weizsäcker adopts essentially the theory of Hatch and Harnack, and writes, for the first time, the history of the Apostolic Church from this point of view. Cf., for illustration, also the popular articles of Carpenter, *Apostles in the Early Church* and *Prophets in the Early Church*, in *The Christian Reformer*, London, April and May, 1887.

ganization of the Church being succeeded by the stationary; the beginning of Church organization on the latter lines even in Apostolic times; the merging of the general into the local ministry, in particular of the teachers in the presbyters, and the higher offices in the bishop; and, in consequence, the twofold position of the bishop, first as an original Episcopos, and then as the successor of Prophets and Apostles.¹

IV. CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

Hermann, a Rabbi, asserts that Christianity, after borrowing from Judaism, and from the systems of philosophy of the time, their general ideas to make them the basis of its faith and morals, was also driven to assimilate a form of worship from the same source.² "Even to the liturgy," he says, "the imitation is complete." Christ bearing his cross to die on Calvary is borrowed from the favorite Jewish scene of Isaac bearing the wood to die on Moriah. The Passover, the first of Mosaic institutions, has become the first among the Christians. Pentecost, too, is a Jewish festival. The third feast of Israel, that of Tabernacles, he claims, was the origin of Christmas, being put, however, on the twenty-fifth of December, the day of the Feast of Purification of the temple. Baptism is the Jewish immersion of proselytes; and the Lord's Supper grew out of the Passover supper. Such facts illustrate,

¹ *The Early Christian Ministry and the Didache*, in *The Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1887. Cf., also, Winterstein, *Der Episkopat in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten*, Vienna, 1886; a good résumé of recent investigation. M. 2.50.

² Cf. *Essais sur l'origine du culte chrétien dans ses rapports avec le Judaïsme*, Paris, 1886, fr. 2.50.

what is often overlooked, that in ritual as well as in law Christ came, not to destroy, but to fulfil. The Apostolic Church had two kinds of meeting. The one, more public, might be held in such places as the courts of the temple, and before a mixed audience; the other was private, for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Along the line of this latter assembly church worship moved away from Jewish forms into the greater liberty of Gospel methods. Weizsäcker finds the worship of the Apostolic Church to have followed an order like this:—

1. Prayer was offered by means of psalms; cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 26; Rev. iv. 11; v. 9; v. 12, 13; xv. 3 f.; xi. 17; xix. 1-8; xii. 10-12.

2. The teaching or sermon consisted of addresses by members.

3. Prophecy followed the teaching part of the service, being a particular form of instruction resting on revelation. The word of wisdom is the more easily understood address; the word of knowledge is the exalted utterance of the seer, coming from the special presence of God's spirit. The prophet heard the word of God spoken to him, and uttered it to the congregation. Two or three prophets might speak; also members who received revelations. Afterwards others might speak, or prove the prophecies.

4. What Scriptures were read, and how, can be only surmised.

5. The Lord's Supper was held more easily among the Gentiles, because such festal meals were common among them. The Pharisees and Essenes also had religious feasts.

6. The kind of liturgy which arose is seen in *The*

Teaching in connection with the Supper. Aramaic words, such as Abba, lingered in the Greek ritual.

7. The doxology and the benediction were also familiar in the Christian worship.

V. ART IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

Early Church Art has formed the chief subject of investigation among Christian archæologists during the past year.¹ The information brought to light is not only curious but valuable, as well for apologetic as for historic purposes.² The natural view of early art, as opposed to the confessional, is receiving more and more adherents. Münz opposes "the artificial mysticism," which tries to find a deep symbolism in primitive church art.³ The Catacomb workers did not hesitate to use heathen models, just as they would deviate from Christian tradition in their pictures to suit their space or to gain proper symmetry. Thus the Magi appear as two or three or four; on one side or both of Jesus, spectators stand with Moses at the burning bush, and with Adam and Eve leaving Paradise, etc. The facts were subordinated to the idea of man's relation to God; hence scenes from the Old and New Testaments were blended and other liberties taken, as the thought of the artist or the space before him suggested. The Roman view, which is fast passing away, and the critical view, which is taking its place, have been

¹ Cf. the valuable *Real-Encyklopädie der christl. Alterthümer*, edited by Kraus, which is now complete, 2 vols., Freiburg, I. B., 1880-86, M. 32.40.

² Cf. *Monumental Evidences of Christianity*, in *The Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1886.

³ *Études sur l'histoire de la peinture et de l'iconographie chrétiennes*, Paris, 1886.

well set forth afresh by Hasenclever.¹ Recent Roman Catholic research has proceeded upon the theory that the works of art in the Catacombs arose under clerical oversight, and that they represent a definite system of doctrine; hence they must be symbolically explained. They were object lessons for Catholic believers, but pictures only for the eyes of the heathen. The decorative non-essentials alone are to be ascribed to ancient pagan art. But Hasenclever shows that there was no need thus to hide Christian teachings under symbols; for Christian tombs were adorned only by Christian hands, and unbelievers never went into the Catacombs. Of clerical government, such as the theory presupposes, the first three centuries know nothing; and Christians, before the time of Constantine, had no such systematic study of art as would enable them to teach theology by pictures. Besides this, there is so much that is heathen in the inscriptions and paintings of the Catacombs that only some sign or chance word enables us to be sure they are Christian. A study of Christian graves shows that their decoration went on in the same way as in the case of the heathen. Ordinary mechanics did the work; they could not set forth Scripture allegorically; besides, there was no allegorical system of Scripture then known in the West. There is, it is true, some symbolism in this early art, but it is simply a connection of Bible thoughts with forms of art already in existence. The conclusion which he reaches is that early Christian decoration of graves is essentially ornamental, not symbolical; what there is symbolical in it has arisen from a combination of already

¹ Cf. *Der altchristliche Gräberschmuck*, Braunschweig, 1886, M. 5.

existing figures with Christian ideas. The figures have made this symbolism, and not the intention to present symbols created the figures.¹ This conclusion is strengthened by the discovery of scenes in sepulchral art depicted from actual life. Five such cases have been found in the cemetery frescos of Rome.² Wilpert has just uncovered a sixth, which represents grain dealers in Rome: the harbor, the ship landing wheat, the porters bearing sacks, two overseers on horseback, all are there. It is found in the Catacomb of St. Domitilla, in a region which was a center of the grain and baker guilds, members of which were buried here, with scenes from their life painted over their last resting-place. These early Christians did not shrink from having their burial places side by side with those of their heathen neighbors. De Waal has just discovered that when the grave of St. Peter himself was unearthed, in the time of Urban VIII., it was found surrounded by pagan tombs. Beside the Apostle there were burial urns, sarcophagi covered with heathen figures, a coin in the dead man's mouth to pay his passage across the Styx, and an inscription to a certain Agricola so filthy that the Pope ordered it thrown into the Tiber.³ All this forms an interesting parallel to the discovery made by De Rossi, that the grave of St. Paul also was surrounded by a heathen burial place full of urns.

Le Blant, in concluding his studies of Christian sar-

¹ Cf., in the same line, Portheim, *Ueber den decorativen Stil in der alt-christl. Kunst*, Stuttgart, 1886, M. 1.20.

² Cf. Wilpert, *Coemeteriale Fresken*, in *Römische Quartalschrift*, Rom, 1887, H. 1.

³ Cf. *Ausgrabungen in St. Peter*, 1626, in *Römische Quartalschrift für christl. Alterthumskunde u. für Kirchengeschichte*. Erstes Jahrgang, H. 1, Rom, 1887.

cophagi in Gaul, reveals similar facts.¹ Christian coffins of stone and heathen coffins occur occasionally side by side in churches, for rich heathen sarcophagi were sometimes taken for Christian use, just as pagan temples were turned into Christian churches. He describes and gives photographic reproductions of two hundred and ninety-five monuments, of which two hundred and sixteen are in this last volume. Of these only one hundred and forty-four are found in Garrucci's great work. The general result which Le Blant reaches is that in Gallic Christian art the symbolic was giving way to the later historic, Roman types. The circle of early art was expanding; he finds here for the first time the scene of Ananias and Sapphira upon a tomb. Favorite pictures are the miracle at Cana (ten times), of the loaves and fishes (nine times), raising of the widow's son (nine times), Christ with the Apostles (sixteen times), Peter (thirty times), Abraham's sacrifice (eight times), Moses striking water from the rock (seven times), Israel passing the Red Sea (eleven times), scenes with deer (thirteen times), male orants (five times), female orants (twenty times).

How simple and naïve this early art was, both in its history and its symbolism, becomes very evident when we glance at the Christian art of the Middle Ages. Didron points out, in a very interesting way, how church decoration, after the thirteenth century, moved along scholastic lines and became encyclopædic in its totality.² Vincent de Beauvais, in his famous *Speculum Quadruplex*, made

¹ *Les sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule*, Paris, 1886, fr. 40.

² Cf. *Christian Iconography*, translated from the French by Millington, and completed with Additions and Appendices by Stokes. 2 vols., Bohn's Library; New York, Scribner & Welford. \$2 a vol.

all things come in analytical and chronological order under the great divisions of Nature, Science, or the world of Thought, Morals, or how thought should act, and History. Church art was to teach scholastic theology, hence we find this system of thought embodied, for example, in the eighteen hundred and fourteen statues which adorn the exterior of Chartres cathedral. There are thirty-six tableaux and seventy-five statues representing the Creation and the Fall. Then, in the domain of Knowledge reached through the Fall, we have set forth Agriculture, the Mechanical Arts, Geometry, and Philosophy, in a series of one hundred and three figures. Next follows the Moral Life, with one hundred and forty-eight sculptures, representing virtues and vices. Finally, the History of Man, endowed with Body, Mind, and Moral Nature, is set forth from the Creation to the Last Judgment, in no less than fourteen hundred and eighty-eight statues. That is the climax of symbolism, a system of philosophy, theology, and history turned into stone.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

I. LITERATURE OF THE SOURCES.

IN 1885, Henry Stevenson published a catalogue of the Greek MSS. of the Palatina, found in the Vatican;¹ now Henry Stevenson, Jr., follows with a list of Latin MSS. from the same source, to which there is prefixed the general introduction of De Rossi on the Vatican Library.² He thinks the Church of Rome had archives from the beginning. They were destroyed under Dioclesian, but revived by Pope Julius (d. 353). The Library was restored at the same time, for Jerome found the Roman Church well supplied with Greek MSS. of the Scriptures (*Chartarium ecclesiæ Romanæ*). No volume of that collection, however, has reached us, although it embraced orthodox and heretical writings, and increased in reputation, till under Gregory I. even the Church of Alexandria looked to it for MSS. The original library was lost, scattered, probably, in the disorders during the period, from the eleventh to the thirteenth century. With what widespread interest it was regarded can be learned from a codex of the Bible, dated A.D. 716, which bears the

¹ Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. iv., 1886, p. 94.

² *De origine, historia, indicibus scrinii et bibliothecæ Sedis Apostolicæ Commentatio*; printed also separately. Romæ, 1886.

inscription *Ceolfriðus Anglorum extremis de finibus abbas*; it was a beautiful copy of the Scriptures brought to Rome by English monks to show their affection.

De Rossi distinguishes three periods of the Papal Library, the second extending from Boniface VIII. to Eugene IV. (1294-1447), the mediæval restoration of this famous collection of books. Faucon here takes up the investigation, giving especial attention to the Papal archives in Avignon.¹ He finds the learning and culture reflected here, especially in the time of Urban V., compare very favorably with the literary attainments set forth in the finest secular collection in Europe, the library of Charles V. of France. We have fortunately the catalogues of both, and made about the same time (1369 and 1373). Faucon is now able to tell us that the library in Avignon contained two thousand one hundred and five volumes, while that of the king had only nine hundred and ten. In 1295, the Papal collection numbered but five hundred and thirty-five books, among which he thinks there may have been a few MSS. from the *Sacra bibliotheca* of Sylvester II. or Leo IX. Most of the works, however, were written in the thirteenth century, and were for actual use. Boniface VIII. was careful of these treasures, and was the first to have an inventory of them made; but in the confusion of his last days part of the collection was lost, though most of it went to Avignon. Here John XXII., a lover of books, enlarged the library, and sought to make it complete. Art, theology, philosophy,

¹ *La Librairie des Papes d'Avignon*, sa formation, sa composition, ses catalogues (1316-1420), d'après les registres de comptes et d'inventaires des archives Vaticanes, T. I., Paris, 1886, T. II., 1887, fr. 20.

science, the favorite Fathers, Augustine and Jerome, all were to shed their light at the literary court of the Pope. The first book bought in 1317 was a Bible, which cost sixty gold florins. Between September, 1319, and August, 1320, the Papal book-buyer spent five hundred florins for books. Some works cost \$70, and even \$130, of our money. Gaps in the lists of Canonical writings were filled by Urban V. These Avignon Popes were interested in missions in Asia, and this led to the purchase of Hebrew, Chaldaic, Arabic, and Armenian books. In 1312, it was decided that at the Papal Court, and in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca, professorships of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic should be established. We hear of two Armenian instructors in Avignon, in 1322.

Under Benedict XI. (1335) we first meet an illuminator in the Papal service; André de Beauvais was paid four gold florins six shillings and seven pence for illuminating three thousand nine hundred paragraphs, eight hundred and fifty small letters, and twenty-nine gold letters. It was the beginning of the great age of the art of miniature in Europe. After reaching its height under Urban V., the library was scattered, some books going to the National Library, Paris, some into private hands, some to Rome, where Nicholas V. gathered a library of five thousand volumes, to repair as far as possible the loss of the Avignon collection. How rich this last collection was, we can now see from the full descriptive catalogue of its two thousand volumes, which Faucon gives us.

Recent research turns our attention next to the Records of the Papacy itself. Denifle has found an inventory of Papal registers earlier than that of 1369; it dates from 1339, and describes the Records as they were when John

XXII. brought them to Avignon.¹ This list embraces the pontificate from Innocent III. to the first year of Boniface VIII. In all, eighty-four volumes are found belonging to the popes of that period. The registers of Coelestine IV. and Hadrian V. only are missing. This catalogue shows that we have all the records now, of the time before Innocent III., that were extant in 1339. Between Innocent III. and Boniface VIII. twenty volumes have been lost, most of them being registers. Still a vast amount of material has been preserved. The archives down to Boniface VIII. exclusive, Denifle finds, contain about thirty-six thousand acts and letters. Several thousand letters are known, which are not registered, so that for the thirteenth century alone the Vatican offers a wide field for research.² We have referred to the library of Avignon in the fourteenth century. The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are equally rich in material. Denifle says Papal registers, not yet in the Vatican, for the time between Martin V. (d. 1431) and Alexander VII. (d. 1667), fill eleven hundred and twenty-one thick folio volumes. The Papacy in those days paid growing attention to books and records, while interest in godliness and purity so disappeared that Luther could say when in Rome, "The Pope is well named Vicar of Christ, for a vicar represents

¹ Cf. *Über die päpstlichen Registerbände des 13. Jahrhunderts u. das Inventar derselben vom Jahre 1339*, in *Archiv f. Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 2 Bd., 1886.

² Langlois is at work here; cf. *Les Registres de Nicolas IV.*, Part I., Paris, 1886, fr. 10.20; also, Jaffé's *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum 1198*, Ed. ii., by Löwenfeld, Kaltenbrunner, and Ewald, which has reached part xiii. in Vol. ii., coming to A.D. 1193, Leipzig, 1887, à M. 6; Berger, *Les Registres d'Innocent IV.*, Part 7, pp. 131-262, Paris, 1886, fr. 8.50, and Prou, *Les Registres d'Honorius IV.*, Part I., Paris, 1886, fr. 9.60.

one who is absent." In November, 1517, a month after the famous theses were nailed to the church door in Wittenberg, we find Leo X. writing to the Archbishop of Magdeburg about Livy's work *De bello Macedonico*.

Under Sixtus IV. (d. 1484), books were freely lent ; under Julius II. (d. 1513), a deposit, *e. g.*, a silver cup, was required of borrowers ; later, no volumes were lent.¹ The library, including, according to Müntz, four thousand and seventy volumes, passed into silence, and beyond the reach of most scholars, until the present Pope made it once more fully accessible. The philosophy of Leo XIII. and his views of the needs of the age led him to take this new departure. As a boy of fifteen, he made a Latin speech on "Christian Rome compared with Pagan Rome," his later studies made him fond of historic and philosophic questions ; so that to open the Vatican, which had been closed three hundred years, was in harmony with the current of his whole life.² He holds that "the permanent monuments of history, when studied with calm and unprejudiced spirit, form the best and most suitable defence of the Church and of the Papacy." God set the Papacy to be the salvation of man, her history will prove that ; hence Leo throws open the archives, which contain that history, and appoints German scholars, like Cardinal Hergenröther and Denifle, to offices as prefect and sub-prefect, that all scholars may see in Papal History the guidance of the Spirit of God. Volumes of Registers line the walls of the consulting library, protected by a wire lattice ; and here sit monks and priests and Protestant scholars from

¹ Cf. Müntz, *La Bibliothèque du Vatican au XVI^e Siècle*, Paris, 1886, fr. 3.

² Cf. Löwenfeld, *Zur neuesten Geschichte des päpstlichen Archivs*, in *Historisches Taschenbuch*, Leipzig, 1887.

France, Germany, Italy, and England, each digging out of these vast quarries materials with which to build the history of his own church and people. The pope is seeking to repair the great losses which the library suffered from the fourteenth century on, by regaining the scattered works. A register volume of Innocent III. was sent back from England in 1885, by the Earl of Ashburnham, after an absence of four hundred years.

The French School in Rome is at work chiefly on the Registers of the thirteenth century; the Italians, on those of the Avignon period; the Austrians, on the history of the Hapsburg House. Of the Germans active here, Pflugk-Harttung is busy on his *Acta inedita*, Vol. ii. of which appeared in 1884, Pieper is studying the History of Northern Missions, and Brieger, the History of the Reformation. Since 1884, admission is gained to the Archives by application to the prefect, stating the aim of the copyist and the period to be studied. Working hours are from 8:30 A.M. to 12 M. As a rule, documents will be shown down to the year 1815. The consulting library is open from October 1 to June 27, every year.

II. CHURCH CONSTITUTION.

The differences found in Church organizations spring, according to Hatch,¹ from the nature of Christianity itself; for, while universal and permanent in spirit, its form must be capable of adapting itself to the changes of human society. This view does not contradict the New Testament, he says, neither does it oppose Christian belief, for all churches admit that they have diverged more or less

¹ Cf. *The Growth of Church Institutions*, London, 1887, 5 sh.

from primitive practices. He shows how, by "gradual steps, the congregational system of early times passed into the diocesan system of later times," . . . "how incompletely organized and subordinate communities came, no less than bishops' churches, to have a local area of jurisdiction; . . . how the communities came to be grouped together in larger combinations on the political lines, first of the Roman administration, and afterwards of the newly formed kingdoms of the West, so as to form the important aggregates which are known as national churches; how the reaction against the decay of morals, and the revival of monasticism, led to the successful endeavor to create for the clergy a higher standard of living, by getting them together into clergy-houses, and imposing on them a special internal organization, and a special relation to the other clergy of the diocese; and, finally, how the change of organization impressed itself on the internal structure of church buildings, and how the erection of chancels and chancel screens set the final seal upon that separation of the officers from the rest of the community, which, more than anything else, may be said to distinguish the churches of modern from those of primitive times."

In France and North Italy, the Romans occupied the cities; the Celts and Germans lived in the country. The Romans were Christian, and their bishop was the leading official; so the diocese arose, its conception being Teutonic, but its framework Roman. Theodore introduced the diocese to England, and Boniface to Germany. The protection of the Church from wandering and unworthy priests led these Episcopal missionaries or Superintendents to emphasize the rights of the bishops as overseers. Accordingly, Boniface revived the Eastern Canons; the

clergy were put under the bishop of the county town ; and presbyters were to be visited by the bishop once a year.

Hatch lays stress upon the fact that the early church officers were officers of a community, and not of a district. "Every town, and sometimes every village, had its bishop." The status of such officers was not recognized, except by courtesy, outside their community ; and transference of officers from one church to another was at first sternly repressed. The modern territorial bishop is out and out a creation of the Middle Ages ; he is a home missionary superintendent, exalted into a hierarchy, and ossified by frequent repetition of groundless claims to Apostolic succession.

In the East, the order of precedence — Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Bishops, etc., — took very definite shape, because of jealous rivalries at meetings of synods, imperial banquets, etc.¹ They were usually arranged according to the importance of the provinces which they represented. The Eastern Church has always considered it the right of the Emperor to elevate bishops to archbishops and metropolitans ; but the Western Church, after taking shape in the mould of the Empire, and gaining provinces like the kings of the earth, has asserted spiritual liberty for her worship, her hierarchy, and the states of the Church.

III. THE MEDIÆVAL PAPACY.

The value of the new material for the study of the Mediæval Papacy consists chiefly in the detailed information which it imparts. Such details, however, can be only

¹ Cf. Gelzer, *Zur Zeitbestimmung der griechischen Notitie Episcopatumum*, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theologie*, 1886, Hh. 3 and 4.

indicated; they cannot be summed up and briefly reproduced. Martens says that the view that Leo IX. accepted the Papacy conditional upon his choice, also, by the Roman people, is incorrect.¹ The Papal tradition to that effect is an attempt to cover up the unpleasant fact that such emperors as Henry III. and IV. appointed Clement II., and three other popes, to meet the direct requests of the Romans.

Through the researches of Felten,² we learn that Gregory IX. was sixty, not ninety, years old when he hurled the ban at Frederick of Germany. Philip of Swabia was guardian of young Frederick II.; not Innocent III., as we have hitherto believed. We now see, also, that the activity of Conrad of Marburg, the inquisitor against heretics in Germany, was more terrible than previous accounts represented it. In 1227, Gregory wrote praising his zeal, and empowering him to call in helpers to crush out errors. The Pope says, "The Germans were always fierce men, so they now have fierce judges." Felten shows that the work, *De tribus impostoribus*, referred to in the charge that Frederick said Moses, Christ, and Mohammed had deceived the world, is a spurious product of the sixteenth, or even the eighteenth century; though he holds that Frederick made some such statement. He further justly emphasizes the point that in this conflict between Church and State "the defenders of the Papacy were also the defenders of national liberty."

By the support of free cities and Italian duchies in fighting their common enemy, the Emperor, the Papacy,

¹ Cf. *Die Besetzung des päpstlichen Stuhles unter den Kaisern Heinrich III. u. IV.*, Freiburg, I. B., 1887.

² Cf. *Papst Gregor IX.*, Freiburg, I. B., 1886, M. 6.

during its century of glory, from Innocent III. to Boniface VIII., showed itself more than a match for any civil power that opposed it. Then came the "captivity" in Avignon, with the sad religious decline of the Papal Court. Recent studies show how widespread was the Church robbery of John XXII.¹ Müller finds² 221 of the 535 instructions of this Pope to the Saxon clergy refer to parish priests, canons, and provosts; only eight to bishops and archbishops. The smallest fish must be drawn into the net of Peter, and pay their penny to the Roman treasury. Clement VI. had the revenues of clerical positions reckoned, down to those which yielded as tax only seventy-five cents. Some ranged as high as five to eight dollars, the same man frequently holding a plurality of benefices, paying toll for each to the Pope. The money thus collected was spent in purple and fine linen, in faring sumptuously every day. Clement gave two hundred florins to the play-actors of the Duke of Normandy; Greek, Armenian, and Moorish ambassadors appeared before the Pope adorned with presents from him; and, in his extravagance, he gave rise to the saying, put in his mouth, "My predecessors did not know how to be popes."

Seventy years exile in Avignon, followed by thirty years schism, brought the Papacy, at the opening of the fifteenth century, to such a place of discord and disgrace that the three great Reform Councils were called to consult for the safety of the Church and Christendom. Some fresh information respecting the second of these, the Council of Constance, has just been given us by Finke,

¹ Cf. Schmidt, *Päpstliche Urkunden u. Regesten aus den Jahren 1295-1352*, die Gebiete der heutigen Provinz u. deren Umlande betreffend — *Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen*, Bd. 21, Halle, 1886.

² *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1886, N. 15.

from two MS. diaries, written by members of the council.¹ We see the motives and plannings that led to the election of Martin V., as observed by an eye-witness. The question of the mode of election was first debated. The Germans proposed that the fifteen Italian cardinals should represent Italy; the seven French cardinals should have eight French delegates added to them; the Spanish cardinal should have fourteen Spanish delegates joined to him; while the fifteen English and German delegates should represent their nations, making in all a conclave of seventy-five members, who should agree in choosing a pope. This plan was objected to, because it would take the election out of the hands of the cardinals. The French then proposed that the cardinals should elect, but that there should be six delegates from each nation, two-thirds of whom must vote to make an election. This plan was finally adopted. The leaders of the conclave were men who had fought Reform through all the Council, and now were met to choose a traditional pope. We are told that every day a choir of boys and the clergy of Constance appeared before the place of meeting and sang the hymn *Veni Creator*. Finally the Cardinal of Columpna lacked but one vote of election; whereupon the Cardinals of St. Marco and Fuxo cast their votes for him, "to unite the Church." The new pope was placed upon the altar, and the *Te Deum* sung; when just at that moment, the diary says, the sweet boyish voices were again heard without, chanting *Veni Creator*. We may well believe that such sounds so moved the electors that they fell upon their knees in grateful prayer, many weeping.

¹ Cf. *Zwei Tagebücher über das Konstanzer Konzil*, in *Römische Quartalschrift*, Rom, 1887, II. I.

IV. THE MONKS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

IN no part of Europe had the monastic system a wider influence than in Britain. Mission monks spread the Gospel among the Celts and Saxons; and in Christian England and Scotland, literary and artistic monks planted schools and built churches from end to end of the land. William the Conqueror was a friend of the monks of Cluny, and when he came to Britain gave them places of honor in his kingdom. Duckett shows that this connection of England with Cluny remained active and intimate until 1457, when the foreign supremacy was abolished.¹ The first monastery of Cluny monks was founded at Lewes, in Sussex, 1077; and the order soon had numerous houses, remaining, however, under foreign rule. French brothers became abbots in England; on the other hand, we hear of William XII., abbot of the Benedictine House of Ramsay, becoming abbot of Cluny, in 1171, and Hugh, abbot of Reading, becoming head of Cluny, 1199. From MS. sources fresh light is falling upon the daily work and life of these monks.² The prior of the monastery of St. Swithin, in Winchester, provided out of his own estate bread and beer, wine and salt, butter and cheese, mats and straw for the floor; the chamberlain must find the monastery table-cloths, and provide old cloths to clean the silver; the sacrist got wax tapers; the cellarer kept the vessels of the refectory in order. The refectorian had certain estates, and was, among other duties, to "daily

¹ Cf. *Record Evidences among the Archives of the Ancient Abbey of Cluni from 1077 to 1534*. (Privately printed, 1886.)

² Cf. Kitchin, *A Consuetudinary of the Fourteenth Century for the Refectory of the House of St. Swithin, in Winchester*, No. I., 1886.

collect the spoons after dinner." Relatives coming from foreign parts to visit monks should "be treated for three days as of the convent, with bread and meat and beer," but such visits must not be oftener than thrice in a year.

The drift in these institutions, as we see, was always away from first love and zeal towards routine, riches, and worldliness. In 1164, we are told,¹ the ruling McDowalls founded a sisterhood of Black Nuns in Lincluden, Scotland, to foster godly learning; but irregularities were soon found among them, and the Abbey was turned into a college church by Douglas, who became its owner. The Abbey of Crosraguel, in like manner, was first exalted, then cast down. Under the Bruces (1268-1370), it flourished, till its abbot was made absolute sovereign of his territory, with jurisdiction in the "four points of the crown," murder, fire-raising, rape, and robbery; but in 1570 it became odious, so that the cruel Earl of Cassellis roasted the abbot.² Even the noble order of the Franciscans, who might be called the Methodists among the monks, could not escape this decay. Ehrle continues to publish new material for the history of this order.³ From a "History of the Seven Persecutions of the Minorites," now given for the first time complete, we see how the decline appeared in the eyes of one of the reformers in the order, who wrote A.D. 1314-1323. It is the complaint of a Spiritual against corruption, winked at by John XXII.

¹ Cf. McDowall, *Chronicles of Lincluden as an Abbey and as a College*, Edinburgh, 1886.

² Cf. Blair, *Charters of the Abbey of Crosraguel*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1886.

³ Cf. *Die Spiritualen, ihr Verhältniss zum Franciscanerorden u. zu den Fraticellen*, in *Archiv f. Litteratur- u. Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, Bd. 2, Berlin, 1886.

and his venal court in Avignon. The brethren were weak against the powerful Curia. John of Parma was deposed; seventy-two zealous Spirituals were banished, two and two, through the provinces; Bonaventura persecuted Olivi and other reformers, even suppressing the old lives of Francis in favor of that written by himself. Ehrle gives new information¹ about the trial of the Spirituals in Avignon before Clement V. In reply to the charge of corrupt living, the order brought the charge of heresy against the Spirituals. The protest against this heresy, and the reply of Ubertino of Casale, are here published for the first time. The whole controversy reveals afresh the utter irreformability of the Papacy of the fourteenth century, when Clement V. collected the laws for the reform of the clergy, and John XXII. published them, but neither could defend the Spiritual Franciscans in their labors for a purer life.²

Respecting the Dominicans, Denifle continues to show that they were the special friends of sacred learning. In the first century of their history, he finds a system of exchange of books among the brethren of a monastery. Next to the breviary, the Bible was most frequently used, an indication that the Scriptures were more read in the Middle Ages than is commonly thought. Philosophy and practical theology were favorite studies, the Dominicans laying chief stress on Bible study and scholastic theology. From the lists of books written by these preaching monks, which Denifle publishes, we see that they wrote commen-

¹ Cf. *Zur Vorgeschichte des Concils von Vienne*, in *Archiv f. L. u. K. G. d. M. A.*, Bd. 2, 1886.

² Cf., in general, Gebhart, *L'Apostolat de S. François d'Assise*, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, September, 1886.

taries, philosophic treatises, and translations from Greek; they discussed bees, the eyes, solar and lunar eclipses, the unity of the mind, and the eternity of matter, free will, sleep, and the interpretation of Hebrew words; "some English students compiled English concordances;" others treated alchemy, the philosophy of Porphyry, Euclid, the strong woman, causes, and every theme in psychology and metaphysics. From catalogues of Dominican "Masters of Theology," prepared in the thirteenth century, Denifle shows¹ twenty such teachers active before A.D. 1258, among the number being Johannes anglicus, Laurentius brito, and Arbertus theotonicus; "all these lectured and debated two and two in the presence of scholars and monks and many prelates of the churches." So the order of Dominicus sent forth a stream of preaching theologians, to refute the heretics and convert the infidels.

V. HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

The great influence of political considerations in early doctrinal controversies has not been always sufficiently recognized. Egypt and Syria rejected the decisions of Chalcedon, not alone because they taught two natures in Christ, but also because thereby the anti-Hellenic feelings of the East could find an utterance. To win these estranged lands was the motive in the many theological union proposals, from Justinian to Heraclius.² This policy led also to the proposal of government candidates for the vacant sees of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Rome,

¹ Cf. *Quellen zur Gelehrten-geschichte des Predigerordens im 13. u. 14. Jahrhundert*, in *Archiv f. L. u. K. G. des M. A.*, Bd. 2, 1886.

² Cf. Gelzer, *Zur Praxis der oströmischen Staatsgewalt in Kirchensachen*, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1886, H. 4.

men who were national Greeks, or, at least, from some foreign diocese. Early in the sixth century, this influence was at work in Antioch and Alexandria; and a little later, in Jerusalem, when monophysite views spread, the court put Eustochius in place of the heretical Macarius. In Rome, but one Greek was bishop before Benedict II. (d. 685); then came seven orientals in succession, four being Syrians and three Greeks. It is not accidental that the Pope who broke with Constantinople was by birth a Roman. The flight of Greeks to the West before Arab invasion helps account for these foreigners in the Western Church, without excluding the interference of the Emperor to put them into high offices.

The iconoclastic controversy drove more Greeks West, and they are found active as papal librarians (Anastasius, 382), writing Lives of Martyrs, and translating Greek legends into Latin (Methodius, 815).¹ These recruits belonged to the monastic, miracle-loving part of the Eastern Church, and helped swell the tide of marvellous tradition in the West. So great a man as Bernard was borne along by mediæval legends and wonders, the marvellous seeming so blended with his whole activity that a recent Roman Catholic scholar, in a learned work, actually finds faith in the Saint as a worker of miracles to be the key to a study of his life.² Similar faith in Divine visions and special revelations is found in other mystics of the school of Bernard, such as Rupert of Deutz. Through the Bible and the Holy Ghost he would attain to the mysteries of God. One of the doctrines which he thus reached—a

¹ Cf. Usener, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Legendenliteratur*, in *Jbb. f. P. Theol.*, 1887, H. 2.

² Cf. Hüffer, *Der heilige Bernhard von Clairvaux*, Münster, 1886, M. 5.

doctrine which Dorner revived with much interest in our own day — was that the Incarnation was a necessary part of the self-revelation of God, and would have taken place whether man had sinned or not.¹ Rochall now finds that this view was not original to Rupert;² it was taught by Scotus Erigena, and the mysticism of Rupert, as that of the twelfth century in general, is found to rest upon Erigena. Rupert, however, has the honor of first presenting this speculative Christology, and in an original way, in Germany.

In such speculation, the danger was ever near that ordinary rational products of the mind, or rationalistic schemes of doctrine, might be regarded as the teaching of the inner light, the Spirit in man's soul. Different systems might well meet here in happy inconsistency. Thus, in the teaching of Thomas Aquinas, the philosophic immanence of Aristotle and the transcendentalism of the schoolmen cannot be harmonized, any more than all the efforts of Leo XIII. will avail to bring Thomas into agreement with the new views of modern culture.³ In the matter of personal salvation, there is similar uncertainty in the teaching of Thomas. He held that knowledge of forgiveness can be a matter only of inference, and cannot be directly known. This doubt of acceptance with God still inheres in the Romish doctrine of justification, as set forth at Trent; feelings and good works are the only source of assurance of faith. With the revival of the study of Thomas, we may look for a revival of this cold, scholastic doubt and uncertainty, which bind man more

¹ Cf. Rochall, *Rupert von Deutz*, Gütersloh, 1886, M. 5.

² Cf. *Zu Rupert von Deutz*, in *Zft. f. k. W. u. kirch. Leben*, 1887, H. 1.

³ Cf. Eucken, *Die Philosophie des Thomas von Aquino und die Kultur der Neuzeit*, III., Halle, 1886, M. 1.20.

and more blindly to an infallible church.¹ Greely objects to the Thomist view of the atonement as absolute satisfaction; neither is he pleased with the Scotist, or so-called moral theory of atonement.² Both are inconsistent. The view of Calvin, as well as that of Ritschl, ends logically in empiricism, skepticism, and the denial of our Lord's divinity, "when it fails to see the real nature of the Law revealed in Christ alone." "The Thomist idea of the universality and moral necessity of law combined with the Scriptural idea that it is revealed in Jesus Christ," Greely finds to be the truth in those ancient systems for all time.

Much importance has been attached by German Church historians to the influence of German Mystics as forerunners of the Reformation. Denifle, however, has just discovered and published the long lost Latin writings of Eckart, the most prominent of these mystics, and maintains that this new source shows that the teaching which here prevailed was essentially a reproduction of that of Thomas Aquinas.³ Eckart was, he says, neither a great genius nor a subtle thinker; but rather through lack of discrimination fell into pantheistic statements. What was peculiar to this later German Mysticism, it is urged, was the doctrine of the divine birth in the soul of the righteous. There was emphasized here, more than formerly, the Being of God in itself, in repose, in contrast to its unfolding and activity in the Trinity. "Not as deep,

¹ Cf. Biehler, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Thomas von Aquino*, etc., in *Ztjt. f. k. W. u. k. Leben*, 1886, H. 8.

² Cf. *The Thomist and the Scotist View-point in Relation to Satisfaction*, in *The New Englander*, October, 1886.

³ Cf. *Meister Eckehart's lateinische Schriften u. die Grundanschauung seiner Lehre*, in *Archiv f. L. u. K. G. des M. A.*, Bd. 2, 1886.

clear thinkers, but as mediators between the scholastic circle of ideas and the understanding of a German-speaking people, do the German mystics deserve great respect." This popular preaching of scholastic theology, Denifle says, began in convents of nuns, when, about A.D. 1287, these were reorganized, and the teaching put in charge of Dominican theologians. What more natural than that they should just popularize theology and put it in German sermons for such a purpose? And that was the origin of the preaching methods of the so-called German mystics. Böhringer, however, well observes that simple scholastic theology was no novelty, that nuns should hear it so eagerly; neither would familiar things in German produce the effects seen in Mysticism.¹

And Carriere thinks that this school of religious thought was broader than the objective mysticism of the Early Church and wider than the subjective, psychological mysticism of the early Middle Ages.² It was a union of both: "one of the grandest products of the German spirit;" and through Tauler and the book "German Theology" reached full development in Luther and the Reformation.

The chief danger in this tendency was the stress which it laid upon the oneness of Humanity with God. Religion was made too much a state of philosophic ecstasy, or absorption of the soul in the Divine. As a consequence, the fallen state of man, his depravity, salvation by Christ, and the terrible doom of the lost, were not made prominent. The general faith of the Church, however, held to the sterner doctrines of ruin, redemption, and eternal

¹ Cf. *Theologischer Jahresbericht* for 1886, Leipzig, 1887, M. 8.

² Cf. *Die philosophische Weltanschauung der Reformationzeit in ihren Beziehungen zur Gegenwart*, second, enlarged ed., Leipzig, 1887, M. 12.

judgment. This is well set forth in the earliest version of Ossian's Prayer, taken from oral tradition about 1512-26, and recently published.¹ The fate of the heathen forms the subject of a supposed dialogue between St. Patrick and Ossian, in which the sad inquiry

“Tell to us, Oh Patrick,
In honor of thy learning,
Have they Heaven truly,
The nobles of the Feinn' of Erin?”

is answered with the words :—

“I tell thee of a truth,
Oisin of the valiant deeds,
That thy father has not Heaven,
Nor has Oscar nor Gaul.”

Ossian urges :—

“Little pleasure it were to me
To be sitting in the city,
Without Cælte, without Oscar
Being with me—or my father.”

But the Saint replies :—

“Better the face of Heaven's Son
To behold it for one day,
Than that all the gold of earth
Were wholly thine.”

Ossian prays Patrick to “bring in the Feinni, unknown to the king of Heaven ;” but the missionary tells him that the king sees the humming fly and the mote in the sunbeam. Ossian then urges that the good king Mac-

¹ Cf. *The Scottish Review*, October, 1886.

Cumall let all men enter his house. Patrick answers, "It is sad to hear an old man sit in judgment upon God." And so the solemn sermon of "the door was shut" was preached by Irish monk and German bishop as they turned Celts and Teutons from worshipping dumb idols to serve the living and true God.

The research of the past year calls us to notice but one more school of mediæval thought, and that is the Waldenses. Montet has cleared away many old errors about them, and settled the question of their origin.¹ They began with Peter Waldo (Valdez) in the twelfth century. Their literature he distinguishes according to three periods: (1) the Catholic, (2) the time when Husite influences were at work, and fully estranged the Waldenses from Rome, and (3) the age when the absorption of Waldensian views took place into the body of Protestant doctrine. He shows, what we did not know before, that the preparatory steps to the adoption of Reformation theology had been taken by the Waldenses long before, in receiving the teachings of Hus.

The discussion respecting Waldensian translations of the Bible in Germany and their supposed influence in preparing for the Reformation is still going on. Müller at first² followed Haupt, and accepted the Codex Teplensis³ as from this source: but the replies of Jostes⁴ and further study have led him to give up that hypothesis.⁵ "The whole pretended Waldensian literature in the

¹ Cf. *Histoire littéraire des Vaudois du Piémont, d'après les manuscrits originaux*, Paris, 1886, fr. 6.

² Cf. *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1886, p. 337 f.

³ Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. iii., 1885, p. 186.

⁴ Cf. *Die Tepler Bibelübersetzung, Eine zweite Kritik*, Münster, 1886, M. 1.

⁵ Cf. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1887, II. 3.

period before Hus springs without exception from Catholic sources, and never was Waldensian.”¹ Berger, however, on the other hand, is thoroughly convinced by the works of Keller² and Haupt,³ and by his own research,⁴ that the pre-Lutheran German Bibles had a Vaudois origin. Apart from this question, Müller gives much valuable information from new sources about the Waldenses. Protestant historians must cease to speak of them as Bible Christians of earlier days. He says they neither undertook to plant congregations of their own in place of the corrupt Church of Rome—their ideal being rather the destruction of all congregational membership—nor did they turn to the lost and those neglected by the Church. They wished rather to win the earnest Christians. They lopped off certain parts of the Catholic system: but that weighs very little in view of the fact that many of the functions of the Roman hierarchy were simply transferred to the apostolic men. They did not change anything in definition of the moral ideal of life, nor in their view of salvation, nor in their treatment of the Church means of grace. Their paternosters were just as mechanical and their use of Scripture just as formal as that of the ordinary churchman. The name Waldenses did not embrace single believers, or congregations, but between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries it meant the apostolic, travelling preachers themselves.

¹ Cf. *Ztft. f. Kirchengeschichte*, 1886, p. 506.

² Cf. *Die Waldenser u. die deutschen Bibelübersetzungen*, Leipzig, 1886, M. 2.80.

³ *Der Waldensische Ursprung des Codex Teplensis*, etc., Würzburg, 1886, M. 1.20.

⁴ Cf. *Revue Historique*, 1886, T. 32.

Their activity was great, and we hear of persecution of Waldenses in Pomerania and Brandenburg, between 1393 and 1459, both before and after their union with the Bohemian brethren. They were widespread here, and in 1480 a great persecution smote them in these lands.¹ The Inquisition could plunder any heretic, living or dead, and rob any Waldensian even for the sins of his grandfather. This awful uncertainty turned the territory of the Vaudois in France and elsewhere into the condition of Christian provinces under Turkish rule.²

VI. CHURCH LIFE.

Of the moral condition of the Frankish Church in the early Middle Ages Caspari has recently added to our knowledge.³ From a MS. of the eighth century he publishes a treatise rebuking the heathen superstitions still current among Christians. Idol altars and groves were visited; men prayed in places of Neptune, by fountains, or beside the sea; good and bad luck were believed in; oracles were consulted; fortunes were told by reading the hand; the Bible was opened at random to find a verse to forecast the future; a man's shadow could do good or evil; the flight of sparrows, the howling of a dog, the rising of a star were all significant; men ploughed, or sent cattle to pasture according to the moon; it was unlucky to meet a priest or monk in the morning; the Lord's

¹ Cf. Wattenbach, *Ketzergerichte in Pommern u. der Mark Brandenburg*, in *Sitzungsberichte d. Berlin Akademie*, 1886, iv.

² Cf. Lea, *Confiscation for Heresy in the Middle Ages*, in *The English Historical Review*, April, 1887.

³ Cf. *Eine Augustin fälschlich beigelegte Homilia de sacrilegiis*, etc. Christiania, 1886, M. 1.85.

Prayer and Apostles' Creed were said against snake-bites, worms, chills and fever, etc. ; and the festival of Janus at the beginning of the year was an especial occasion of heathen practices. Fortune-tellers and abortionists are especially denounced as servants of the devil.

Similar evils are opposed in the Eastern Church by Jacob of Edessa, a contemporary Syrian writer, whose canons have just been published.¹ He forbids using pieces of sacramental bread for charms ; water and anointing oil, however, may be put under the communion-table, and then used to help the sick ; dust from about the communion-table might be put in the food of the sick, but not in their beds or hung about the necks of cattle, for particles of the holy bread might be in it. He forbids tying threads to the table at communion, to be bound afterwards upon the sick ; that is a play of evil. The priest should not take the empty communion-cup to the sick, to cross the suffering part with it ; the Bible, however, might be laid on the place of pain. Water in which persons were baptized was not to be given to women to sprinkle their houses with. Holy oil must not be put in the ears to keep Satan out. The work of the deaconess was to attend sick women, sweep the sanctuary, light the lamps in the absence of presbyter or deacon, anoint women when baptized, and she might in a nunnery give the Lord's Supper to the sisters and small boys, but not take it from the altar or touch it there. Deaconesses remained longer in the East than in the West, because of the more secluded life of the women. By the twelfth century, however, they were long extinct,

¹ Cf. Kayser, *Die Canones Jacobs von Edessa*, übersetzt, erläutert, zum Theil auch zuerst im Grundtext veröffentlicht, Leipzig, 1886, M. 9.

for the Church then ceased to be missionary, and female converts were no longer baptized. Jacob says the orthodox (Jacobite) clergy must not eat with heretics, much more not share the Lord's Supper with them. Adultery with a heathen is not punishable the same as with a Christian. Jewish customs are to be avoided, "for there are ignorant priests who keep the mother of a boy forty days and of a girl eighty days from the Church." Mice cannot defile men — as the Armenians think — only sin can defile.

CHAPTER III.

THE MODERN CHURCH.

I. INTRODUCTORY.

HISTORIC research, especially of the later periods, is frequently spoken of as a matter of secondary importance, which contributes little to the intellectual or moral culture of the student; but a recent utterance of Stubbs, the best qualified scholar in England to speak on this subject, says that "the study of modern history is, next to theology itself, and only next in so far as theology rests on a divine revelation, the most thoroughly religious training that the mind can receive." He then continues, "It is no paradox to say that modern history, including mediæval history in the term, is co-extensive, in its field of view, in its habits of criticism, in the persons of its most famous students, with ecclesiastical history."¹

II. THE REFORMATION.

Through recent publication of long-buried works of Wiclif, we begin to see that the light of the Morning Star of the Reformation extended much farther and shone more steadily than has hitherto been supposed.² Here Hus got

¹ Cf. *Seventeen lectures on the Study of Mediæval and Modern History*, Oxford, 1886, 10 sh.

² Cf. *Tractatus de Ecclesia*. Now first edited from the MSS., etc., by John Loserth, London, 1886, 15 sh.; also, his *Dialogus sive speculum militantis ecclesiæ*, edited by A. W. Pollard, London, 1886.

his doctrine of the Church which brought him to the stake. Here was started a stream of influence which ran quietly through Europe. We now learn that it spread from Bohemia into Austria, Poland, Hungary, and reached even Croatia.¹

This Reform movement laid stress upon the vigorous theology of Augustine, the supreme authority of Scripture, a purer conception of the Church, and the duty of work for Christ by every Christian. It helped make Luther possible; and when he took up the unfinished work, he planted himself upon the same Augustinian principles, and laid stress upon the same views of Bible and Church. To him it was then given to lead the Anglo-Saxon world into free thought, free conscience, and free life, for he was a born leader of men to God, and had a commanding place in the development of religion. Bayne associates Luther with Shakespeare, working together unconsciously in building up the broad culture of Europe.² The German character found a full and many-sided representative in the great Reformer; its strength and its weakness are both there. The latter appears in the refusal of Luther to take the proffered hand of Zwingli, for the individualism which loses itself in internal dissensions is the weak element in German life. The Lutheran and the Reformed Churches have not been able to live together, the followers of Luther usually — as well before the Thirty Years' War as after it — have refused to meet the Reformed

¹ Cf. Loserth, *Ueber die Versuche twelisch-husitische Lehren nach Oesterreich, Polen, Ungarn, u. Kroatien zu verpflanzen*, in *Mitthl. d. Vereins f. Ges. der Deutschen in Böhmen*, xxiv. 2.

² Cf. *Martin Luther: His Life and Work*. New York, 1887, 2 vols., \$7.00.

half-way.¹ We see with growing clearness how Philip of Hesse sought to unite all Protestants, in Germany and beyond it, in a league, but was thwarted by the theologians.² In 1656-57, as we now learn, the Elector Charles Louis of the Rhine Palatinate proposed, on behalf of the Reformed, to Duke Eberhard III. of Württemberg, on behalf of the Lutherans, a plan of union; but the Lutheran theologians of Württemberg and Jena, according to Steiner,³ would have no union except by the Reformed becoming Lutherans. No agreement could be reached on the doctrines of the Lord's Supper, the Person of Christ, and election. The Reformers fought their way out of the terrible embrace of Rome with such vehemence that they could not at once learn the lesson of toleration for apparent errors in one another. Recent studies continue to show in detail how the corruption of the Papal Court poisoned every branch of the Church. Here English and Italian sources agree with those of Germany. In Nottingham, one of the chief manufactures in the fifteenth century was image-making.⁴ The alabaster here was turned into objects of devotion. We hear of Nicholas Hill, an image-maker, suing William Bolt, a salesman, in 1491, for fifty-eight heads of John the Baptist which he had not paid for. We find that pardoners with their indulgences were just as active in England as in Germany.

¹ Cf. A. Baur, in *Prot. Kirchenzeitung*, 1886, S. 1131, quoted in *Th. Lit. Ztg.*, 1887, No. 7.

² Cf. Heidenhain, *Die Unionspolitik Landgraf Philipps von Hessen u. die Unterstützung der Hugenotten im ersten Religionskrieg*, Breslau, 1886, M. 3.

³ Cf. *Der Zürcher Professor Johann Heinrich Hottinger in Heidelberg*, 1655-61, Zürich, 1886, fr. 3.

⁴ Cf. Stevenson, *Records of the Borough of Nottingham*, Vol. iii., 1485-1547, London, 1887.

An action was brought in 1518 to recover five shillings promised for the right to sell pardons in Birmingham and Nottingham. Romish customs long lingered. In 1606 the bells were rung on "Our Ladie Eve;" the clergy were paid to bury persons within the church; and in 1638 flowers were brought for decorating the church.¹ Under Henry VIII., heretical views were regarded as necessarily accompanied by bad character, and punished accordingly. One of the Antinomians mentioned² was Sarah Barbone, perhaps a relative of the leather-seller in Cromwell's Parliament. They would not take the oath before the court, considering that tribunal unlawful. They were charged with sacrilege also; at Salisbury, "they have dug up an old bishop out of his grave, and made a mazzard (cup?) of his skull, and his bones are in an apothecary's shop." The vicar of Sunstroke was accused of being "a professor of the Art Magick, and in particular, charming of pigs." In such circumstances as these, Henry VIII. put himself in the place of the Pope, as censor of morals and final court of appeal.³ The monasteries had broken away from the English bishops to submit themselves directly to the Pope; and now they fell into the hands of the king, with no claim upon the help of the prelates. Cranmer prepared for a visitation of the convents; but Henry anticipated him and sent out his own inspectors. Gairdner says that the monasteries had some corrupt inmates, and not

¹ Cf. Money, *The History of the Ancient Town and Borough of Newbury*, etc., Oxford, 1887.

² Cf. Gardiner, *Reports of Cases in the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission*, The Camden Society, 1886.

³ Cf. Gardiner, *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.*, Vol. ix., London, 1886, 15 sh.

a few idlers, but probably not one of them could supply as mean a set of men as the king sent out as visitors. Their report was a tissue of lies; and the fact that it does not contain more badness shows that the English monks were not as corrupt as is usually represented. We see, as never before, that everybody at court, from Cranmer down, submitted to Henry's tyranny; Chapuys, the imperial representative and friend of Queen Katherine, appears as the one man of righteous soul and honest contempt for the time-servers about him.

Henry, with his Star Chamber, crushed all opposition, just as the Pope, with his Inquisition, suppressed all freedom of thought. A striking illustration of this Papal tyranny has just been published by Benrath, describing the suppression of Protestantism in Venice.¹ Here the free movement gave rise to an Evangelical party, and also to a fanatical Anabaptist sect. The conflict between these made them an easy prey to Rome, and both were crushed before the end of the sixteenth century. The story of these Venetian martyrs is most pitiful. They were usually taken out in a boat and cast into the sea. The cruelty of these rulers, in both State and Church, was the more terrible because it rested upon a principle; in the one case upon a false view of the divine right of kings, in the other upon a false view of the divine right of popes. Hence it was natural that the Reformers very early attacked the theory of the Church upon which the Papacy was built. Rome held that the existing visible Church, with its legal system and hierarchy, is to be recognized as divine authority, because it is the unavoid-

¹ Cf. *Geschichte der Reformation in Venedig*, Halle, 1887.

able and sufficient means of edifying the Church in the sense of a community of redeemed.¹ Hus rejected this estimate of the legal element, by laying stress upon the distinction between the Church and a civil state, and showing that the legal order is secondary and conditional in a spiritual society, whose unity rests upon spiritual communion. He denied the necessity of subjecting the whole Church to one central legal order, the Papacy. The outward order is one of service to the brethren, and not of rule over them. Gottschick thinks that Luther was not indebted to Hus for his idea of the Church, but developed it independently, and from his own view of redemption. It is especially important to observe that the keystone of his theory of the Church, the knowledge that the priesthood of all believers took away all difference of spiritual character, that preaching the Word and dispensing the sacraments are only the exercise of an office which belongs to all believers, but is confined to particular persons by the congregation only for the sake of order, this fundamental principle was reached independently by Luther. Zwingli's view agreed essentially with that of Luther. The objections of Anabaptists, however, that children should not be received into the Church, because they could not believe, led both Reformers to review their Church theory. Luther opened a door for the children by going towards the Catholic Church, and putting a mystical effect in baptism, through which infants received faith. Zwingli would not do this, but held that children can belong to the Church really, though they have not faith; for faith is the manifestation in time of God's eternal choice. All children of

¹ Cf. Gottschick, *Hus, Luther u. Zwingli*, in *Zft. f. k. Geschichte*, 1886, H. 3 and 4.

Christians belong, according to God's promise, if not to the Church of the elect, yet to a Church of God, which, according to God's will, must embrace both unbelievers and non-elect. The perfect Church cannot be realized in this life; for man cannot tell true from false faith. Thus Zwingle distinguished between the Church of the elect and the visible Church.

In some of these details we may differ from the teaching of those mighty men of old; but the Reformation theology, as a whole, which turned Europe upside down, has continued to be the active element in Christendom until our day.¹ Candlish finds that recent Biblical criticism has given us a more correct Bible text than the Reformers had, and changed some of their proof passages; but the doctrines involved are left much in the same position as before. "The general effect of modern scholarship has been to confirm the views of the Reformers as to the great leading doctrines of the Bible." Some modifications, however, he thinks, are necessary. Modern theology lays more stress upon the historical element in Scripture, and the development of doctrine in it. The evidence of Christian doctrines is sought rather in the Bible as a whole than in a collection of proof texts. Less reliance is put on particular words or expressions of Scripture. Doctrines are not proven from a single word or clause, or inference from some incidental remark. The imputation of Adam's sin as immediate or mediate should not, he thinks, be argued "from the precise turn of expression used by Paul in a single passage." "Thus the modern theory of a probation after death, based on a single and

¹ Cf. Candlish, *Reformation Theology in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, in *The Presbyterian Review*, April, 1887.

very difficult passage (I. Pet. iii. 18-20), and the doctrine of a millennial reign of Christ on earth, founded on one passage in the Apocalypse, seem as precarious as the Scripture consequences insisted on by the old divines." The clearer light that comes from the history of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon shows that the Reformers' views of Scripture were right. We may, however, admit, he says, that Luke fell into an anachronism about the census of Cyrenius; while in the Old Testament we must recognize "a freer use of the ancient literary device of bringing out the meaning of events by speeches of historic personages, than used to be thought consistent with an inspired history." The relation of the Scriptures to science is "that the Bible contains a revelation of religious truth, and not of science at all, and in all its references to the physical world speaks according to the appearance of things and the current ideas of the times."

In some respects modern science wonderfully confirms Reformation theology. The fact of heredity is a striking analogy to the doctrine of original sin; that of bio-genesis, to the doctrine of regeneration; that of degeneracy, to the principle set forth in the parable of the talents. In reference to the doctrines of creation, providence, and prayer, it is not science that rejects them, but the philosophic theories built upon the facts of science; and so far as metaphysics is concerned, Candlish thinks it is questionable whether much progress has been made since the days of the Reformers.

III. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The Reformation itself has long been regarded as the best proof of the corruption and decay of the papal sys-

tem. Until recently even Roman Catholic writers admitted this, and saw in the regeneration of their Church an indirect reaction from the Reformation, the chief regret being that the reform led to a division in the Church. But now Ultramontanism, as represented by such a historian as Janssen, has grown bold with power, and proceeds to set the facts of the Reformation in a new light. The grand aim of his book¹ is to show that Catholicism, as early as the middle of the fifteenth century, was already in a process of healthy regeneration, when the spirit of revolution, rebellion, and lawlessness burst forth in Protestantism, and destroyed the good work in its beginnings. Since then, there has reigned in the world, especially in Germany, insurrection and immorality. How far all this is from the truth appears in the work of Creighton upon the same period.²

He finds many things in the Reformation period which mark it as "one of the most ignoble, if not the most disastrous, in the history not only of the Papacy but of Europe." The Popes were victorious in their struggle with the Reform Councils, and yet the Church did not prosper. From the height to which Pius II. (d. 1464) brought it, there was a half-century of continuous religious decline, till it reached the low condition where it was found by Luther. The victorious Popes had to face a new problem. The old "idea of a Christian Commonwealth of Europe had crumbled silently away," and the Roman

¹ Cf. *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*, 3 vols., 7 ed., Freiburg, 1886, à M. 7.

² Cf. *A History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation*, Vols. iii. and iv., *The Italian Princes*, 1464-1518. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1887, \$7.00. The best book in English on the subject.

Church must learn how to adjust itself to the new political system which was replacing that of the Middle Ages. And beyond this lay the still more difficult problem of preparing the mediæval ecclesiastical system "to meet the spirit of criticism which the New Learning had already called into vigorous life." Nicholas V. put himself at the head of the Humanists, but Creighton considers the literary glories of his reign as but an episode. Paul II. stood aloof from the Renaissance, for, while the Humanists were not heretics, they turned men away from Christianity, without teaching them any real reforms. In their midst a Latitudinarian creed grew up. Gemistos Plethon (1448) advocated "the Hellenic theology;" and his pupil, Cardinal Bessarion, could speak of the dead teacher as gone to Heaven "to take his part in the mystic dance of the Olympian gods."

Sixtus IV. began the secularization of the Papacy; and it was continued by Alexander VI. and Julius II., who ruled as Italian princes. Under these Popes the Papacy ceased to be a moral bulwark against free thought, weak faith, and corrupt living. It became vile itself, and was not ashamed of its vileness. The cardinals Cæsar Borgia, Ascanio Sforza, Giuliano della Rovere, and the cardinals of Monreale and Segovia, are all mentioned as sufferers from venereal diseases. Creighton, however, does not think the Borgias used poison, for, he says, poisoning was a very bungling process in the fifteenth century. Dijem, the Sultan's brother, did not die from poison, but from bronchitis. The story, also, that Alexander VI. died from a deadly draught, intended for a wealthy cardinal, is pronounced unhistoric. The corrupt Papacy was but part of the body-politic of those days.

Louis XII. and Ferdinand of Aragon were as bad as Alexander VI. The decay in religious belief was followed, in the end of the fifteenth century, by political and social corruption. Alexander VI. seemed worse than others, chiefly because he was not a hypocrite. The shock of the Reformation first awoke Rome again to spiritual activity. Historic dignity returned to Europe with the sixteenth century, when the Papacy, strong in material prosperity, was called to the bar of awakened public opinion to make answer, not as the leading Italian power, but as the head of the Christian Church. During the centuries that followed the Reformation, Rome became less and less a temporal power, and more and more a spiritual despotism, till now, when the Papacy owns but a palace or two in Rome, the Pope speaks from the Vatican as the infallible Head of the Church.

During our century many things have favored the Catholic Church.¹

The Illumination and the Revolution were followed early in this century by a reaction in favor of Romanism. Shaking thrones and troubled statesmen looked towards the unmoved Papacy, and made terms with it. After the fall of Napoleon, the Pope and the Jesuits were restored together to Rome, and that society has made its plans guide the Church. The Revolution of 1848 frightened kings again into favoring Rome, while the greater liberties granted the nations were used by Catholic teachers to spread their faith, in all kinds of societies. Pius IX., when opposed by Church tradition, replied, "I am Church tradition," and Cardinal Manning declares that dogma is

¹ Cf. Koffmane, *Abriss der Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Erlangen, 1887, M. 4.

superior to history. Everywhere Ultramontanism has conquered by tyranny and violence. The piety fostered is of the ignorant Spanish sort, that loves the miraculous, especially appearances of the Virgin, which accompany the Jesuit doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The pains of Mary are now known to have been seven; four of them — the prophecy of Simeon, the flight into Egypt, the loss of Jesus in the temple, and the Virgin at the cross — are all that can be found in Scripture; the rest — Mary meeting Jesus bearing his cross, the body of Jesus in his mother's arms, and her sorrow at his burial — the Holy Ghost revealed to the Church in the eleventh century. "All our hope rests on the cross, all our confidence reposes on Jesus and Mary, upon the suffering of the Son and the co-suffering of the mother."¹ The learning of the Church is drifting into the narrow service of Ultramontanism, and sinking beneath the pressure of the Jesuits. A good illustration of present Roman Catholic scholarship can be seen in a "Theological Library," which is being published in Germany.² The first series of it, Church History, by Hergenröther, Dogmatics, by Scheeben, Bible Introduction, by Von Kaulen, etc., is now complete. A second series will supplement the first, especially in the department of Practical Theology. Koffmane sums up the history of Roman Catholicism in this century thus: The Church has had conflicts on all sides, and yet no rich history; in controversy with modern States, victory and defeat have alternately been her portion. But her inner history is that of growing poverty

¹ Cf. Gühr, *Die Sequenzen des römischen Messbuches*, Nebst einer Abhandlung über die Schmerzen Mariä, Freiburg, I. B., 1887.

² Herder, Freiburg.

of true piety and learning. The masses are excited to blind enthusiasm for the Church, but the gentle spirit of Christ does not govern her. The mediæval Church sought to embrace all relations of life,—social order, art, science, the whole world of thought and emotion,—but the power to act as representative of culture has now gone from Rome; and the gain of outer power is a poor substitute for it. That is probably a pretty correct estimate of the Roman Church, as she appears in her recent history in Germany. In England, however, after long persecution,¹ the Catholic population is more national and English than at any time since the Reformation. The Romish Church began to be felt as a power in America in 1847, when it was attacked as venal and a foe of the Republic. This period of hostility continued until 1875, when the first American Cardinal was appointed.² Since that time the relations have been pleasanter between the Church and the American people. This is due as much to a change in the Church as in public opinion. A majority of the seventy-six bishops are now American born, and the Church is daily becoming more American. Protestantism influences it indirectly; one archbishop and five bishops, we are told, were formerly Protestants, while not a few priests are converts to Romanism. The Roman Church here is becoming more American; but what next? The Review writer thinks the American Church of Rome

¹ Cf., for persecution in the XVII. century, *North Riding Record Society*, Quarter Session Records, Vol. iii., London, 1886; and for the period from 1791 to 1820, Amherst, *The History of Catholic Emancipation, etc., in the British Isles*, 2 vols., London, 1886, 24 sh.

² Cf. *The Roman Church and the American Republic*, in *The Westminster Review*, June, 1887.

is not workable, first, because it is nearly as full of agnosticism and free thought as any other part of the nation ; further, because of the growing independence of the priests, such as Dr. McGlynn ; and, finally, because the referring of protests and appeals from the American Church to Rome is becoming ridiculous and irritating.¹

IV. THE GREEK CHURCH.

The Greek Church has, in our century, broken the bonds of her lifeless conservatism, and begun to move and grow. There is increase in both numbers and zeal. Old sects are enlarging and new ones appear. The revived national feeling in Greece and Russia has led to a quickening in the national churches. In 1860 this new life and the better education of the clergy in Russia gave rise to a missionary society for work in the Caucasus country ; and in 1866 a society was formed for preaching among the Mohammedans and heathen in the Empire. This mission is now at work in Japan with surprising results.² The Greek Church, however, in Russia continues intolerant towards Protestantism. The attempt has been renewed (1885) to force the German Lutherans into the Russian Church. The University of Dorpat must change its language and spirit, or cease to be. The last historian of this struggle thinks the outlook is hopeless for Protestants.³ But these Protestants can hardly be destroyed.

¹ For the earlier history, Cf. Shea, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Times*; the 13 colonies—the Ottawa and Illinois country, Louisiana, Florida, Texas, N. Mexico, and Arizona, 1521–1763. New York, 1887, \$5.00.

² Cf. Koffmane, *l. c.*, c. 5.

³ Cf. Zahn, *Abriss einer Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche auf dem europäischen Festlande im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart, 1886, M. 3.

Besides the Lutherans, who prevail in Kurland, Riga, and Livland, there are about a million more scattered through the Empire. Other sects, too, help break the united tyranny of the Greek Church. The Raskolniks, or Russian Seceders, number now about fifteen millions, and are rapidly increasing. There are thirty-five thousand Methodists, and a large number of denominations, devout and rationalistic, fanatical and philosophical, all leavening the Empire with thoughts of religious liberty.¹

V. THE PROTESTANTS IN AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

The sad story of the Reformation and counter-Reformation beneath the cruel rule of Austria has just been told us from original sources by Wiedemann.² In 1652 few Protestants were left. In one district of two hundred congregations, 22,224 persons were forced back into Romanism. The priests were so indolent in the work that the government punished them, and monks were sent to persecute the "fanatical but very moral Protestants." Wiedemann shows how utterly demoralized the Romish Church was in Austria. In 1781 Joseph II. granted tolerance to the 73,722 Protestants; in 1788, 156,865 were bold enough to confess their faith; in 1821 a Protestant school of theology was opened in Vienna. But every legal hindrance was put in the way of the Reformed Churches. Only through fear has Austria given liberty. In 1848 Revolution extorted freedom of faith for Protestants; but in 1855 a concordat put Austria in the hands of

¹ Cf. Heard, *The Russian Church and Russian Dissent*, New York, Harper & Bros., 1887, \$1.50.

² *Geschichte der Reformation und Gegenreformation in dem Lande unter der Enns*, Bd. v., Prague, 1886, M. 12.

the Jesuits and the old policy. France and Prussia humbled Austria later; and again the Protestants got further concessions.¹ They now have a constitution, a Synodical government, and have adopted the Second Helvetic Confession. They have eighty churches, and 120,764 adherents, most being in Bohemia. Not a few of the clergy are rationalistic in their teaching. The Lutheran Church in Austria has one hundred and forty-three churches and 289,133 followers.

The Protestant Church in Hungary is a martyr church. In 1525 the government said, "Let the Lutherans be freely taken and burnt;" yet through all persecution these saints persevered, and now there are three million Protestants in the land. They too have adopted the Helvetic Confession and the Heidelberg catechism. The German Protestants in Hungary are Lutheran, and number one million in the three million spoken of. The Unitarians have 55,487 members, chiefly in Siebenbürgen. They have a theological seminary of their own, and receive aid from America.

VI. THE HUGUENOTS.

D'Avenel says that Church life in France has passed through three stages — persecution, domination, and union.² Under Louis XIII. the bishops were rich, the priests were poor and also ignorant. Some could not repeat the sacramental terms correctly; there was found in a Paris church an altar to Beelzebub, and some of the people did not know there was a God. Couturier, an

¹ Cf. The essay of Von Tardy in Zahn's book, already quoted.

² Cf. *Le clergé français et la liberté de conscience sous Louis XIII.*, in *Revue Historique*, 1886.

agent in Rome to secure church livings in France, made a fortune of 1,200,000 francs. The Church made some reforms, but the corrupt state dragged her down again.¹ Even Huguenot nobles had abbeys, and drew their income. The clergy were secularized, and in the latter part of the sixteenth century three-fourths of the churches were without real pastors. Bourdoise said, with horror, that the worst things done in his day were done by priests. He wrought for reform; so did Olier, Vincent de Paul, and others, who revived purity and learning in France. Such Reform was good; but what was needed was a religious Revolution, and that was prevented by the destruction of the Huguenots. From hitherto unpublished letters we learn afresh how those men of conscience died for the truth of God.² The inquisitor Jean de Roma poured oil into the shoes of the Waldenses, before he made them hold their feet over a blazing fire. He says he tortured only four out of one hundred and fifty whom he examined; and held that "warming their feet" was not as cruel as the common method of the rack, which crippled a man for life. The slightest pretext was followed by persecution. From MS. sources we learn of an emigration of Protestants from France in 1752, because they were charged with baptizing "in the name of the holy trinity," instead of "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."³ It was hard to tell sometimes where the path of duty lay; and where Christian expediency might pass over into unworthy compromise. The most promi-

¹ D'Avenel, in *Revue Historique*, 1887, N. Jan.-Feb.

² Cf. Herminjard, *Correspondence des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*, T. vii., 1541 à 1542, Genève, 1886, fr. 10.

³ Cf. *Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme français*, Bulletin, July, 1886.

nent case of such questionable concession was, of course, that of Henry of Navarre, the leader of the Huguenots in the darker days before and after the massacre of St. Bartholomew. The most thorough account of that ruler's good deeds as a king, and his lack of moral purpose as a man, has just been written by Baird.¹ Henry became a Catholic in order, five years later, to be able to protect the Protestants by the Edict of Nantes.

VII. CHURCH LIFE IN HOLLAND AND BELGIUM.

In Holland, the conflict between Kuyper,² leading the orthodox against Rationalism and a political church system, and all State church Latitudinarianism, has become more intense. The Ecclesiastical Council of Amsterdam under his influence refused to take unbelieving young persons into the church; whereupon the church courts threatened the elders with suspension. A conflict then arose about property belonging to orthodox churches, Kuyper declaring that the present Reformed Church, with no doctrinal tests or discipline, is a cage of unclean birds, its authority is not to be recognized, and local congregations alone have any legal existence or right to exercise discipline and hold property. Not a few orthodox differ from him, because they defend the State system; but, on the other hand, a good many rationalists think he is right in claiming for the Calvinists a church built on the Synod of Dort, and agree with him that a church which can legally include both Buddhists and Calvinists is too broad to exist very long. The synod of the

¹ Cf. *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, 2 vols., New York, 1886, \$6.00.

² Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. iv., 1886, p. 196 f.

Reformed Church has just deposed five preachers, and seventy elders and deacons, followers of Kuyper, declaring them disqualified for office or membership in the Church.¹ In Holland the battle is against Rationalism; in Belgium the struggle is with Romanism. During the past forty years² the Protestant mission Church of Belgium has grown from seven to twenty-five congregations. It has adopted the Reformed Belgic Confession, and lives up to it, as was seen in the expulsion of Pastor Byse of Brussels for preaching conditional immortality. This mission Church has over four thousand members, and is free from State interference. The Evangelical national church has ten thousand adherents with a Synod.

VIII. THE GERMAN CHURCHES.

Ritschl is closing his *History of Pietism*³ and finds that in the nineteenth century it is repeating the course which it took in Halle in the eighteenth century. The Pietism of Franke asserted itself, 1690–1720, against all opposition, and was in the ascendant until 1750; from that time till 1780 it declined, and now survives only in individuals. In this century there has been a revival of this tendency, chiefly through the Moravian Brethren. It appeared about 1820, and, after much less opposition than Spener and Franke met, gained the supremacy in the national churches about 1850. It has maintained its position by

¹ Cf. Wicksteed, *An Ecclesiastical Storm in Holland*, in *The Christian Reformer*, May, 1887, London; and *Die gegenwärtige Krisis in der niederländisch-reformirten Kirche*, in *Deutsch-evangelische Blätter*, 1887, H. 2.

² Cf. Zahn, *l. c.*

³ Cf. *Geschichte des Pietismus in der lutherischen Kirche des 17. u. 18. Jahrhunderts*, 3 Bd., 2 Abth., Bonn, 1886, M. 7:50.

assuming the garb of Lutheran orthodoxy, which, Ritschl says, when looked at more closely, turns out to be the Melanchthonian form of Lutheran tradition. The earlier Pietism in South Germany Ritschl divides into (1) that of Württemberg and (2) that of the Moravian Brethren. As in our day, it was then also a barrier against the incoming Rationalism. The movement in the South differed from that in Halle in having a fulness of evangelical thought and a large number of original, strong men. This was due chiefly to the social and political peculiarities of Württemberg. Here clergy and people accepted the new life, and it ran its course within the church, whereas in Halle the tendency was more towards Separatism. The school of Franke revived Lutheran doctrines; but men like Pfaff in Württemberg made the views separating Lutherans and Reformed a matter of indifference, lying outside religious experience. But this making some doctrines indifferent led up to the formal orthodoxy of Storr and others.¹ It is hard for an ethical, Kantian theologian, like Ritschl, to appreciate the warmth and devotion of the men called Pietists. It is still more difficult for a scholar such as Prof. Frank of Vienna, who has just written an essay on *Mysticism and Pietism in the Nineteenth Century*.² He finds the converse of modern Rationalism to be Obscurism, or Mysticism, or, since 1830, Pietism. It brought in the Prayer-Meeting movement. It made simple New Testament faith its creed, and the atonement its fundamental doctrine. Its followers must be "converted men." Frank says it reproduced the "torture, blood, and hell doc-

¹ For the battle of tendencies as experienced by Tholuck, cf. Witte, *Leben F. A. G. Tholucks*, Bd. 2, 1826-1877, Leipzig, 1886, M. 8.

² Cf. *Historisches Taschenbuch*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 197 f.

trines" of the old Pietism. Awakened souls called themselves "worms," and as penitents "crept into the wounds of Christ." Philosophy was despised; and prayer could cure both soul and body of disease. This revival movement spread even into the Roman Catholic Church. Its worst foe was not vulgar Rationalism, but speculative Philosophy. Still it has survived them both, and, Frank admits, in a confessional form, is now flourishing over the grave of transcendental speculation. Turning to the general movements amid which the historic development of the Church has gone on in this century, Sell finds¹ that in the world of thought and culture the drift has been towards making science an independent power beside the Church, and putting the logic of facts and history in place of theology. A social transformation can be seen in the transference of power to the men of money and education. With this we hear of discontent among the masses, who threaten to upset wealth and learning, as wealth and learning a century ago upset the old aristocratic rule. The religious development itself consists, for the Roman Catholic Church, in its definite change into the universal empire of an infallible pope; for the Greek Catholic Church, in the spread of her old teachings over new fields; for Protestantism, it consists in this, that through the gradual separation of churches from the State and the formation of free churches, through the growing exchange of ideas and mutual works of benevolence, there is springing up a kind of higher unity among them. The present duty of the Church, he says, is (1) to preach the

¹ Cf. *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert*, Gießen, 1887. A lecture.

Gospel to all peoples, (2) to develop a Christian humanitarianism, which shall overcome all national jealousy, and (3) to heal our great social evils.

The different churches perform these duties very differently. (1) The Roman Catholic brings to men the Pope; the Greek, the Czar; the Protestant, the Bible. (2) The Roman Catholic is international in her nature; but as she is ultramontane, she heals national divisions only by imposing upon men the higher Latin Church nationality. The Greek Church has fallen into the hands of Greek or Slavonic nationalizing. Protestantism, being chiefly a collection of churches bearing a particular national stamp, seeks, through the transmundane ideas of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, to elevate the individual nations, educate, and restrain them. (3) The Roman Church, being now a system of powerful international associations, can hardly offer the autonomous State disinterested service in overcoming social perils, for this very territory is its own place of usury. The Greek Church lacks all capacity for educating men. Protestantism is, either, through entanglement with the State, not free enough, or, in the isolated position of its churches and lack of great corporate organizations, not strong enough, to bring its rich forces of faith and love so into application that in these alone might be found a sufficient defense against the dangers which threaten society. Zahn holds, in his work already referred to, that the Reformation theology and life, which once saved Europe, are the only means that can save it again. He applies Calvin's *Consensus of Evangelical Doctrine* to the German churches, and finds them all wanting. The saddest sign of the present day is that the chastising love of God has been withdrawn.

"We are neither worthy of the truth nor of suffering for the truth." The Protestant Church of Germany is weak before Romanism, for three reasons: (1) Her shield, the Scriptures, has been broken by her own teachers. Baur, Strauss, and their followers have sowed endless evil through the churches. "The destruction of the authority of the Bible is the seed of many theological professorships." (2) The overthrow of the Reformed Church, by rigid Lutheranism, has brought decay, for "the decline of Calvinism in Germany is the decline of Protestantism." The Lutherans made common cause with Rome in fighting Bismarck, and forced him to go to Canossa. What can such men, he urges, with their ecclesiasticism, Pelagianism, and their Bible pulled to pieces by the critics, do against Rome? (3) The Lutheran theologians of Germany, as Professor Walther of St. Louis described them, are all synergists, and no longer followers of Luther. Hengstenberg spoke of degrees in justification; Beck's theology was synergistic and legal, and shows that it is not possible for our century to revive the truth of the Reformation. "Hase, like Schleiermacher, Julius Müller, Tholuck, and Rothe, is a proof that God has not granted to our generation the power to assert in its purity Luther's faith with true sorrow of conscience." Ritschl's theology teaches that all we have to aim at is to do our duty in our place of work, led by the thought of the providence of God, who has already granted us pardon in himself for our sins of ignorance, without any expiating death of a mediator. He teaches, on the one side, the true doctrine that God reveals himself only in Christ, and that what the Bible teaches is for the use of the Church; but, on the other side, that, as we can judge all things only

according to our perception of them, we can know nothing definite about Christ's personality, the facts of his salvation, or his present relation to the Church. All we can know of him we learn in the Church founded by him and filled with memories of him. "In this way Ritschl loses the doctrine of Christ's preëxistence, His expiatory death, His personal rule of the Church, and the constant living intercourse of individual believers with Him." His theology, Zahn says, excites no interest among the churches, for it brings nothing but what everybody knows; its sum and substance, in the vernacular, being — Do your duty and fear nobody. Such a theology, he urges, is the clearest sign of the complete exhaustion of German Protestantism. And yet there is no doubt but the school of Ritschl is now the most striking appearance in the theological world. Even Schleiermacher did not captivate so many young theologians as follow this recent tendency. What is the cause of such wonderful popularity? Professor Hermann Schmidt finds some of the reasons to be: (1) the very difficulty and obscurity of the strange terminology used by the new master; (2) but, most of all, the claim that here is a system which makes peace between Rationalism and Supernaturalism by reaching a higher ground, where Pfeiderer and Luthardt, the *Protestantenverein* and the Positive Union, all appear as rationalists, by bringing philosophy into Revelation. So did not Luther.¹

In theology, as hitherto treated, there have appeared the opposites of subjective faith and objective Saviour,

¹ Cf. Schmidt, *Bedeutung u. Stellung der Ritschl'schen Theologie unter den dogmatischen Richtungen der Gegenwart*, in *Zft. f. kirchl. Wissenschaft u. k. Leben*, 1886, H. xi.

inner life and being of God, and his relation to the world ; philosophy and history have claimed a word here. Now Ritschl promises deliverance from this battle of opposites ; he will free theology from the problems of both philosophy and history. Theology and world-knowledge must part. The world of phenomena, with all its psychological happenings, belongs to the science of the universe ; the inner world of man is the place of theology. The revelation through which this new world is opened to us, and by which the doctrines of faith reach certainty, Ritschl finds to be Jesus, and him alone, for neither Old Testament nor New Testament writers have the quality of Revelation. We reach Jesus here, not by the way of historic treatment, meeting him as mediator of Revelation ; but only through the consent which the contents of this Revelation extorts from us. Certainty here rests on experience ; but this certainty is not in the religious feeling, but in the will, where the truth of Revelation expresses itself. Moral necessity impels us forward towards the realization of the moral ideals which, under the working of this Revelation in us and in Christ, experience fulfilment. The contents of this Revelation is the kingdom of God, which Christ has founded. It is the communion of those who act from the pure motive of absolutely universal love. Here man knows himself as an aim of God, and finds the ground of assurance of salvation. There is a religious element, also, in this entrance upon the kingdom, for man must be conscious of the normal relation to God, as absolute Love. In this self-recognition as one with God we find that we are superior to the world ; we experience our infinite worth ; we are free from what is sensual and unworthy of our faith toward God and our love toward

men. Such faith is essentially faith in Providence, whose aim is our aim, and will express itself in thanksgiving; petition has no place in an unconditional faith in divine love, which has ordered all things for the best for God's children. The atonement of Christ was needful only to take from sinners their distrust of God. Justification is not, therefore, for individuals, but has to do only with the whole congregation; the individual, on entering the congregation, receives of the gift which belongs to the whole. Direct communion of the soul with God would lead to mysticism and pietism, which are unchurchly and unlutheran. Christ works upon us only through the Church. Schmidt thinks this theology, built on Kant's dualism of the phenomenon and the noumenon, will not last long. He points to Kaftan, in Berlin, who ascribes fundamental importance to the resurrection of Christ, and thereby breaks through the fetters which keep theology in the subjective world. Häring of Zürich is moving in the same direction.¹ Luthardt urges the inadequacy of this theology to comfort the dying, to instruct the young, to strengthen the weak in serious cases of conscience.² It fears emotion; it puts Christ far off; it can speak of the hot prayers of Luther as "sins, into which his battle for the cause of God drove him."³ Such teaching cannot arouse enthusiasm or stir the souls of ordinary men. Zahn says the meetings of the *Protestantenverein*, even in

¹ Cf., however, his lecture, *Die Theologie u. der Vorwurf der "doppelter Wahrheit,"* Zürich, 1886, F. 1.

² Cf. *Zur Kontroverse über die Ritschl'sche Theologie*, in *Ztft. f. k. W. u. k. Leben*, 1886, H. xii.

³ Cf. Herrmann, *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*, Stuttgart, 1886, M. 3-50.

liberal cities like Berlin and Hamburg, are less attended and call forth less interest than formerly ; its polemics against creeds, its barrenness in mission work, at home and abroad, and its inability to win the very unbelievers to whom it made concessions, have brought it more and more into discredit. Rationalism has poisoned the heart of Germany. "A thing unheard of in all history presses with destroying power upon the present ; the thought of an unseen world has vanished, a thought which, in the days of Luther, seized the world with shuddering fear." Another idea, which penetrates both the heathen and Christian world, the idea that there can be no communion with God without satisfaction and sacrifice, Zahn says, has also been taken from the modern conscience ; "and in this deepest of all needs we stand below every degree of human development." Such views are more pessimistic than most observers can accept, for men of very different schools admit a religious revival throughout Germany. Hoenig, a liberal theologian, says ¹ that the Church cannot "tear herself away from orthodox pietism, that still clings to her ; that at a time when intellectuality has renounced all orthodox principles, these latter yet flourish in the temples of our country." He admits the activity of the orthodox synods ; home missions form a field for their energy ; and he must allow that the lower classes "incline to the more ponderous religion of pietism, because this latter comes nearer their standard of intellect." ²

¹ Cf. *Distress in the German Protestant Church*, in *The Unitarian Review*, December, 1886.

² Cf., also, Bixby, *Present Aspect of Religion in Germany*, in *The Unitarian Review*, July, 1886.

IX. THE CHURCHES OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Two points are made very prominent by recent ecclesiastical writers in England. The first is that the English Church was not called into existence by some act of Parliament, but continues to be the ancient Church;¹ and, second, that this historic Church was capable of reform, and has been reformed. By what doctrinal renovation, however, it has been purified and made Apostolic again — that is still matter of discussion. A recent essay by Pocock² holds decidedly that this reformation took place on Calvinistic principles. Heretics, from Wiclif down, are charged with opinions which Luther would have rejected, a very frequent accusation being that the consecrated elements were considered to be only bread and wine. Every collection of Confessions puts the thirty-nine articles among the creeds of the Reformed Churches. The “breeches” Bible ran through one hundred and fifty editions, in the latter part of the sixteenth century, and the notes, and the catechism put between the Old and New Testaments, carried Calvinism to every part of Britain. From 1552 to 1619, Pocock shows, the Articles were uniformly expounded as Calvinistic: it was the Restoration Settlement of 1662 which allowed a more Catholic subscription, and opened the way to the later and different creed of the Church. This early Calvinism was revolutionary, and its influence made the movement under Cromwell a religious struggle, and not a mere

¹ Cf. *History of the Reformation in England*, by G. G. Perry, in *Epochs of Church History*, London, 1886, 2 sh. 6.

² Cf. *The Restoration Settlement of the English Church*, in *The English Historical Review*, October, 1886.

battle of classes, as Guizot and Buckle represent it.¹ It made Presbyterianism in England a political power, which produced a self-governing aristocracy. The anti-monarchical party divided, the army adopting Independency and toleration, the citizen subjects, especially of London, holding to the recently erected Presbyterian State Church.² In this connection Delbrück observes that the State must always lean upon the Church, when it does not have a standing army; this fact sheds much light upon mediæval relations, and the early Reformation period. In correction and discipline the Church ruled the nations, hence princes fought to make the ecclesiastical system monarchical, the Estates would have it aristocratic, the populace wished to make it democratic — hence the conflicts.

The drift in the Church of England from William III. to Victoria started "with the time when by the Act of Toleration the Nonconformists began to be relieved from the intolerant laws imposed by the State; it ends with the time when they find themselves on a political equality with the Church. It commences with the time when religious Nonconformists thought that there ought to be a National Church, and sought to be comprehended (on their own terms) within its pale; it ends with a time when a . . . band of political Dissenters teach that there ought not to be a National Church, and strive to compass its destruction."³ These somewhat bitter statements show a plain tendency

¹ Cf. Brosch, *Oliver Cromwell und die puritanische Revolution*, Frankfurt A. M., 1886, M. 10.

² Cf. Delbrück, *Hist. u. politische Aufsätze*, Berlin, 1887.

³ Cf. *The Church in England from William III. to Victoria*, by A. H. Hore, London, 1886, 2 vols., 15 sh.

in the national life of England towards a free Church in a free State, or the disestablishment of all churches. The verdict of history is against churchliness and hierarchical narrowness. It is a little surprising to learn that the Church of England was never so flourishing as it was at the death of Charles II. Then came a change. With William III., a Dutchman, a Presbyterian, and a Calvinist became ruler of a Church, English, Episcopal, and moving towards Arminianism. He disliked the Tory Churchmen, encouraged Dissenters, and put all Protestants on a level to encourage liberty and toleration. Hales and Chillingworth, the Cambridge Platonists and Cudworth had prepared the way for more freedom, and now under royal favor a Latitudinarian school sprang up, all-powerful, under men like Burnet, Stillingfleet, and Tillotson. The doctrinal aim was, to avoid superstition, on the one hand, and enthusiasm, on the other. Church authority was rejected for the sufficiency of the Scriptures, interpreted by each man's private judgment. A rationalistic element came in, which taught that all would be saved who lived according to the law and light of nature; a man need believe only what he understands. This spirit showed itself, (1) in the denial of the divinity of Christ, and ran into Unitarianism; and (2) in the denial of revealed as distinct from natural religion, and landed in Deism. These two forms of Rationalism agitated the Church with controversies through the last quarter of the seventeenth and the greater part of the eighteenth century. Added to this unbelief there was great corruption in morals. The private life of Queen Mary, with its pure dignity, was a striking contrast to the shameless life of the times. She says, "I resolved to

do what I could toward making devotion looked on as it ought.”¹

Under Queen Anne, the Church was at its height. Hore dates its decline from the accession of the German Lutheran George I., when the State crippled the Church, (1) by appointing latitudinarian and political bishops, and (2) by depriving the Church of its synodical rights. From 1715 on, for one hundred and thirty-seven years, Convocation did not meet. The bright side of the eighteenth century in England has received a classic description from Lecky.² It was an unimpassioned age, “singularly devoid of both religious and political enthusiasm,” but for that very reason, he thinks, “a century of good sense; of growing toleration and humanity; of declining superstition; of rapidly extending knowledge; of great hopefulness about the future.” The spirit of Reform, however, was much weaker then than now, for that “has been largely stimulated by the Evangelical revival” and “by the great development of the press.” The French Revolution spread ideas of benevolence in England; but, Lecky says, “the great Methodist and Evangelical revival of religion” was at the center of the renewed moral life in England in the closing years of the eighteenth century. Hore admits all this also, but adds that the fifty years of Evangelical supremacy in the Church — till 1833 — saw a terrible state of religious neglect.

¹ Cf. *Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England*, 1689-93, by Doebner, London, 1886.

² Cf. *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, vols. iv.-vi., New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1886-87, \$2.25 each; cf., also, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, by Abbey and Overton, a new edition, in one volume, London, 1887, 7s. 6d.

The artistic and intellectual side of man's nature was not cultivated by the Evangelicals, and the drift was more and more towards Dissent. Meeting-houses in Wales increased from thirty-five (in 1736) to one thousand. Non-conformists in England were four per cent. of the people in 1727; in 1800 they were one-fourth; and under George IV. Dissent was in possession of the large towns.

In reference to the fourth great awakening in the Church, the Oxford movement, Hore says the folly of the bishops in opposing it drove many to Rome, just as Episcopal blindness thrust Wesley and the Methodists out of the Church.

The chief mark of religious progress in England, during the past fifty years, Hatch finds ¹ to consist in the greater harmony which prevails between religious life and all contemporary life. Even the disputed territory of Evolution is yielding not a few peaceable fruits of love and goodwill. Symonds says that "the main fact in the intellectual development of the last half-century" is "the restoration of spirituality to our thoughts of the universe." ² This, he holds, is one great result reached by Evolution. "Much dreaded Darwinism leaves the theological belief in a Divine Spirit untouched." He thinks, however, that the doctrines of the Fall, of Miracles, the Argument from Design, the Resurrection, and Ascension must all fall before the development system. But the general drift of his thinking shows, and that in a striking and unconscious way, that the great things claimed for Evolution as a science of life are just the

¹ Cf. his essay in *The Reign of Queen Victoria*, edited by J. H. Ward, 2 vols., London and Philadelphia, 1887, \$8.00.

² Cf. his article *The Progress of Thought in our Time*, in *The Fortnightly Review*, June, 1887.

truths which Christianity has long taught, put into scientific terminology. He says the faith of the scientist is "that nothing can come amiss to those who have brought their wills and wishes into accord with universal order;" that is just another way of saying, "Not my will, but Thine be done." A further conclusion of science, that "the only thing we can be said to know and to be sure of is the paramount importance in ourselves of mind," is in the line of the words, "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Even the cosmology of Evolution, which is "Law and God, the order of the whole regarded as a process of unerringly unfolding energy, and that same order contemplated by human thought as in its essence mind-determined," is New Testament teaching in Darwinian diction. Evolution has overturned the polytheism of popular unbelief, just as Christianity overthrew the polytheism of Greece and Rome; and when the new scientific reform begins to formulate its religious faith, it finds itself in not a few respects strikingly in harmony with Christianity. The Gospel and Evolution agree that the creative power which underlies both is everywhere one and the same.¹

X. THE AMERICAN CHURCHES.

The Pilgrims and Puritans in New England form the subject of a recent work of interest, written by a British scholar.² He very properly says: "The founders of Massachusetts were many of them rich men, furnished with

¹ For a handy history of the English Church from the earliest times to the present, from a Churchman's point of view, cf. Jennings's *Ecclesia Anglicana*, New York, Thos. Whittaker, 1887, \$2.25.

² Doyle, *The English in America*, The Puritan Colonies, 2 vols., London, 1887.

ability, dwelling peaceably in their habitations, who forsook the good things of this world to win for themselves and their children a home free from its corruptions." They did not come to America on a crusade for the rights of mankind in general, but to secure their own rights and liberty. The condemnation of Antinomian heretics may have been a political necessity, yet, Doyle holds, it showed an indifference to proper legal principles equal to the worst cases of injustice to Nonconformists in England. This intolerant side of Puritan life in Massachusetts, the burning of witches and persecution of heretics, is set forth by Adams in extreme fashion, under the name of historic impartiality.¹ But such things did not last long, and were condemned at the time by the Pilgrim churches. The Puritan spirit demanded freedom from what it was certain was wrong, but could not all at once tolerate what others were equally certain was right. But severe denunciation of the founders of Massachusetts is unhistoric, and, in the case of the Quakers, not after their spirit. Conscientious men might do some pretty severe things. Modern critics must condemn the Puritans ordering Quakers to be branded, whipped at the cart's tail, or hanged; but it must be remembered that to the vision of those days, and amid reports of Quaker fanaticism and religious socialism, it seemed a matter of life and death. In explaining the indecorous acts of the Quakers, Hallowell makes it probable² that the story of two women entering a church in Boston, and breaking bottles in the minister's presence "as a sign of his emptiness," is groundless. The only such case was that of Thomas Newhouse, in 1683, and he was later dis-

¹ Cf. *The Emancipation of Massachusetts*, Boston, 1887, \$1.50.

² Cf. *The Pioneer Quakers*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1887, \$1.00.

owned by the Friends. But he offers no proof to warrant any substantial deviation from the statements of standard writers on this subject.

The Puritan teaching of New England looks sour and severe to some recent writers; but strength and consistency always have an air of mercilessness to men who waver or are weak. Not a few critics, who consign New England theology to the limbo of obsolete curiosities, have never mastered the system which they reject. It is much easier to be infallible than to be industrious, and to condemn on general principles than after patient research. The present *Aspects of the Liberal Movement in Theology* are summed up by Allen¹ thus: "(1) An increasing seriousness of temper, as compared with the buoyant optimism of forty years ago. (2) The clearer recognition and acceptance of the method of science, as compared with that of pure sentiment and speculation. (3) The attempting of positive tasks, or the study of positive problems of ethics, especially of social ethics, instead of resting content in the intellectual joy and pride of discovery of truth or emancipation from mental error."

This is the "large and generous and real and consecrated liberalism" into which it is the great privilege of American Unitarianism to have at length arrived. Vance Smith sums up the Unitarian position² "in this: that we adhere to Christ as the one true 'Leader of our faith, and Captain of our salvation,'" "that we put aside all other names, as unworthy to stand beside his, or to supersede his; that we take him alone as the Way, the Truth, and the Life, for all Christian men." This Christ, however,

¹ *The Unitarian Review*, September, 1886.

² *Ibid.*, November, 1886.

he terms only man ; the Father alone is divine, and the Bible knows nothing of a Trinity, or of the godhead of Jesus of Nazareth. A good deal of such teaching, as at present set forth, Dr. Peabody says, is too often "able and eloquent attempts to solve unsolvable problems."¹ Not very successful at home, it shrinks also from bearing its treasures to the uncultured heathen. A second Unitarian missionary is preparing to go to India, to take the place of Mr. Dall, who turned Brahmin or esoteric Buddhist.²

¹ *The Sunday School and the Church*, in *The Unitarian Review*, November, 1886.

² Cf. Heywood, *Our Indian Mission and our First Missionary*, Rev. C. H. A. Dall, Boston, 1886; and for the drift in American Unitarianism cf. Frothingham, *Memoir of W. H. Channing*, Boston, 1886, \$2.00.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

THEISM, APOLOGETICS, DOGMATIC
THEOLOGY AND ETHICS.

BY

REV. GEO. NYE BOARDMAN,
PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY,
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

INTRODUCTORY.

No works of preëminent importance in systematic theology have come under our notice during the past year. There have, however, been several works of an instructive and interesting character, and some of more than ordinary ability. It is to be noticed also that a wide range of topics has come under discussion. We do little more, the present year, than chronicle the thoughts of others, without entering upon a criticism of their works.

I. THEISM.

*The Self-Revelation of God.*¹

This work has many of the qualities which characterize *Philosophical Basis of Theism*, by the same author, — a book noticed in CURRENT DISCUSSIONS for 1884. It is, in fact, a continuation of that work. The author there presented the basis on which a scheme of theism is, as he considers, to be erected; he has now added the superstructure. In the present volume he gives, with great

¹ *The Self-Revelation of God.* By Samuel Harris, D.D., L.L. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.

copiousness of thought and great wealth of detail, his views as to the manifestation of deity in the universe. He finds God everywhere, so that one could almost believe he would answer the question, "Can you find God in the world?" with the words "I cannot find anything else." He is not by any means a pantheist, but finds that God is immanent in nature and the ultimate in all that is subject to thought or observation. The absolute being, God, is considered as so obviously necessary to give consistency and completeness to science, to philosophy, to any scheme of morals, that, in the author's view, he may be said to reveal himself in all the occurrences of nature and history. The distinction between natural and revealed theology, so it is held, should be abandoned,¹ for the revelation is one and continuous, extending from man's dim early consciousnesses to the full exhibition of the Divine in Jesus Christ.

The remarks made four years ago concerning the fundamental principles of Professor Harris' speculations are applicable to the present work, and need not be repeated. We shall simply notice the principles on which he bases his belief, — what he considers established knowledge, and then notice some of his applications of these principles.

If the question is asked, "When can a thing be considered as known, what can we rest upon as proved?" our author replies: "It seems incontrovertible that reason must accept as true every principle the truth of which is necessary to its own rationality and capacity of knowing. If the rejection of a proposition involves the confusion of reason itself, that certainly is valid ground for accepting it as true."² Again he says: "Whatever

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 448.

² *Ibid.*, p. 252.

issues in universal skepticism must be rejected as false. . . . We cannot but accept as true what our whole mental constitution demands. We must accept that the denial of which implies that man's whole mental constitution is untrustworthy." ¹

Dr. Harris uses the word consciousness in a very broad sense; he makes it include the object, and thus include some very distant objects. He says: "The matter given in it is nebulous and undefined," but he holds that by continued mental activity the dim content comes into clear light. "In its object-consciousness it [the mind] perceives the sensible object, which presents or reveals itself in the sensations. When a person, by words or deeds affecting the sensorium, makes also the impression, through the spiritual susceptibilities, of rationality, freedom, love, or other personal or spiritual properties, the mind, reacting, perceives not only the body through the sensations, but also the rational, free, personal being through these impressions of reason or spirit. The man perceives the Thou as well as the I. And, in a similar way in the conscious, religious impressions responsive to the supernatural and the infinite, the mind, reacting, perceives the being that is divine, revealing himself in the consciousness." ²

This view of consciousness prepares us for the author's view of our knowledge of objective being. He has no trouble in passing from the subjective to the objective. With him both are embraced with equal firmness in the same simple act; knowledge is ontological in its inception and in its development. It is not necessary to prove the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 372.

² *Ibid.*, p. 74.

objective reality of external things ; we know them as real in simply knowing them. "In every perceptive intuition a rational intuition is implicit. In one and the same act we perceive the object in the presentation of sense and in the forms of reason. By the intuition of reason the man knows that every beginning or change has a cause, that every action reveals an agent, and every phenomenon a being. He does not merely perceive impressions which are disintegrated and unsubstantial, or only subjective, but he perceives the being which reveals itself in them, and gives them unity and substantiality. . . . Thus the transition from the subjective impression in consciousness to the objective reality is securely made."¹

The author understands science to be the comprehension of nature through the ideas of God revealed in nature. Our knowledge really amounts to nothing unless it takes on this form. "This object [one that acts on the sensorium], therefore, is revealed to the mind not merely as an external object occupying space, but also as having the quality of intelligibility ; it is capable of being apprehended in an idea, and, through this as its intellectual equivalent, of being known. . . . It had a quality of ideality, that is, of being apprehended in an idea, before I had any idea of it in my consciousness. Every object in nature, therefore, is inherently and essentially intelligible. . . . We study the universe, and find in it the *Mundus Intelligibilis*, the world of archetypal thought. Science is nothing but the enunciation of what this world of archetypal thought revealed in the universe is."² "The evidence of the presence and direction of this master-work-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 257-9.

man is found in nature by science. It is the declaration of this wisdom in nature which constitutes science. Science rests on the assumption that the reason whose master-workmanship is revealed in nature is the same in kind as the reason in man that discovers it in nature ; that man participates in the light of reason that is universal.”¹

It is with these principles of knowledge and belief that our author sets out in his search for the manifestations of Deity, for the self-revelations of God. Whatever would put reason to confusion is to be rejected. Whatever is needed to sustain its assertions may be postulated. Reason is active in all the operations of sense, and perceives a reality wherever there is a phenomenon, therefore the reality of cause and substance must be accepted. When any truths are accepted, we may admit with them all that is necessary to bring them into order and system, for we do not know anything except as we know it scientifically, that is, know it as of the archetypal ideas of God. Any line of thought, therefore, must lead to God ; we shall find him in whatever direction we may move. He is the environment in which we live. We know only through his ideas, and ideas do not float about loose ; they must have their being in their author. The following is a good illustration of Professor Harris' method of argumentation. “If we admit the simple proposition imperatively demanded alike by common sense and philosophy, that every motion, thought, and action must be the motion, thought, or action of a being, then we must admit the existence of the absolute Being as the eternal principle and ground of all beginning and change, of all finite power, knowledge,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 516.

and being. And, conversely, if no absolute Being exists as the ultimate ground of all, then there is no being and no knowledge ; but all knowledge is volatilized into a phantasmagoria of nothingness." ¹

The author carries his search for the manifestations of God into four departments of investigation : our consciousness ; nature as the theater in which powers are manifested ; nature, including man, as the means by which God is manifested as personal spirit ; and the scheme of redemption. In all these departments the treatment is full, item after item is brought forward to illustrate the subject, objections are carefully considered, false systems of thought are acutely reviewed, and the entire theme is illuminated with apt quotations drawn from a great variety of sources. We will notice, in closing, a few of the points at which, as he reads nature, God comes to view. (1) He thinks God is so the environment in which we move that we are conscious of him as present, at first dimly, then more clearly. (2) The component parts of the idea of God are known separately, then together ; — we know the absolute by intuition, being by self-consciousness, spirit from our own personality ; and so we have the elements of the idea of absolute personal spirit. (3) In our moral consciousness we find ourselves in the presence of the absolute Reason as the source of law. (4) God is involved in our scientific consciousness, for all science rests on the existence and the recognition of the universal Reason. (5) When we look from ourselves to the universe, we find God in it ; it is a necessity of thought that, in knowing the external world, we know the absolute

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

Being as the ground of its existence. "In the absolute Reason we have the ultimate all-conditioning Being of which the whole universe, physical and spiritual, is the revelation."¹ (6) Because man is like God, in his image, he cannot fail to see that God exists. (7) The First Cause cannot be caused, and we may legitimately postulate a first cause, for we reach it, not by following back a series of causes, but by intuition of the absolute. "Everything, in revealing itself, reveals also to the thought the absolute Being."² (8) Science is based on the assumption that the sum of all forces is always the same; this power must be the antecedent and cause of all finite powers; it must, therefore, be the transcendent cause of the universe. (9) The causal energy which sustains the universe must transcend it and be absolute, for if it is limited to the finite universe the universe becomes a mechanism which constructs itself, which would involve the absurdity of a self-generating and perpetual motion. (10) In nature, bodies, whether large or small, never come in contact with each other; when they act upon each other they must, therefore, act at a distance; but this is absurd; there must, therefore, be an absolute Being to whose energy the movements of nature are due.

These are but a few items taken from the volume of thought of which this work of Prof. Harris consists.

*The Methods of Theism.*³

This essay, of one hundred and thirty-eight pages, is remarkable for its distinct presentation of the two leading

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

² *Ibid.*, p. 158.

³ *The Methods of Theism.* An Essay by the Rev. F. R. Beattie, Ph.D., D.D., Brantford, Watt & Shenstone, 1887.

questions of Theism: Whence the idea of God? What the evidence that the idea is truthful? remarkable for the variety of views which it presents and criticises, and remarkable for its careful analysis of the arguments in favor of Theism. The author is clear in the statement of his own views; we wish he had been a little more full, in some places, in his support of them.

His first inquiry is concerning the origin of the idea of God. He rejects the theory that the idea arose from natural evolution, either by the method of fetichism, henotheism, or ancestor-worship. He says, in reference to the last: "The objection Spencer raises against Comte (*i. e.*, against fetichism) holds good against himself. Before ancestor-worship can be developed into theistic belief, the mind must already possess the theistic concept. Here, again, Spencer must succumb to the suicidal conditions which his own philosophy imposes upon him."¹ After asserting that theism is the condition of revelation, so that the latter cannot be the basis of the former, and after denying that the idea of God can be derived as an inference by any rational process, he says: "We would suggest the view hinted at by some recent writers, that the primitive theistic conviction in the human mind is to be regarded as God's testimony in man's soul or spiritual nature to his own actual existence. In him we live and move and have our being."² This idea of God he considers intuitive, — intuition being explained as a natural capacity, tendency, or instinct towards belief. The idea, however, needs expansion and illumination by means of study and reflection.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

The author devotes the main part of his essay to the question, whether the idea of God is simply subjective, or whether we may hold that there is a corresponding objective reality. He enters on the discussion of this point with this precaution: "We must always keep in mind the nature and relation of the theistic proofs to each other. The proof of God's existence has many strands, and these must be taken unitedly, not separately, in estimating their argumentative force."¹ He finds that the ordinary arguments for the divine existence are complex, and that they do not wholly conform to the terms by which they are designated. In place of the usual qualifications, ontological, cosmological, etc., he proposes the following as more fitly descriptive of the several arguments: onto-theistic, aetio-theistic, cosmo-theistic, eutaxio-theistic, teleo-theistic, eso-theistic, ethico-theistic, and historico-theistic. He considers Anselm's well known formula the best specimen of the pure onto-theistic argument, but commends highly, as of the same essential character, the position assumed by Descartes, to which Prof. Harris so constantly resorts, "That, before we know God, we can have no perfect knowledge of anything else. . . . The theistic hypothesis is thus the postulate of all knowledge. The only alternative is absolute skepticism."² He considers that the aetio-theistic argument is good so far as to prove that there is an uncaused cause of the universe, and that the cause is mind, not matter. It thus paves the way for other arguments. The principle at the basis of the cosmo-theistic argument is the sufficient reason, and the author holds that this proves the intelligence of the first

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 49.² *Ibid.*, p. 61.

cause. He does not seem to us to present the argument from order in its full force, but establishes well the conclusion, "That the inference from the finality in nature to intelligence or purposing mind is a strictly valid induction."¹

We have not space to follow the argument farther, except to notice that he finds in the eso-theistic argument the warrant for holding to a power behind phenomena, ever revealing itself to us; and in the ethical argument proof that there is an authority above us on which the law of conscience is based.

*Philosophy of Theism.*²

Professor Bowne's new work on theism is written in the easy, somewhat flippant style characteristic of the author. It brings forward a theme on which he has written before, sometimes with great clearness and cogency. He appears at his best in replying to an opponent, but his positive argumentation is generally pertinent if not always convincing. Exception might be taken to his premises in some instances, but this hardly detracts from the instructiveness of his treatise. He shows in manifold ways that theism must be accepted fully, cordially, and without a doubt; that atheism is demoralizing, debasing, and suicidal, yet admits that the existence of God cannot be logically proved. He holds that science implies his existence, the interests of mankind demand it, the tendencies of men make faith in his existence inevitable, and, therefore, atheism should be discarded as a wretched

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

² *Philosophy of Theism*, by Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1887.

and worthless thing. It is quite amusing to notice how Professor Bowne and Professor Harris come to the same conclusion, through means that are absolutely at war with each other. Bowne says of theism: "It assimilates the facts to our own experience, and offers the only ground of order of which that experience furnishes any suggestion. If we adopt this view all the facts become luminous and consequent."¹ Of the reasoning of atheism he says: "This reduces to saying that things are as they are because they must be. That is, the problem is abandoned altogether. The facts are referred to an opaque hypothetical necessity, and this turns out, upon inquiry, to be the problem itself in another form."² Harris says: "Thus in every line of thought the knowledge rises self-evident before us, that there must be an Absolute and Unconditioned Being. We properly recognize it as a primitive and universal truth known in rational intuition. The idea of Absolute Being and the belief of its existence are in the background of human consciousness, and at the foundation of all knowledge of human thought."³ Thus, both these authors make the existence of God the pre-supposition of science. But one makes science subjective mental action, the other makes it the development of the consciousness of objective things. Professor Harris holds that we are conscious of our environment, even of God himself; while Bowne holds that perception is a mental construction which the intellect forms in reaction against a sensation produced by an external stimulus. In this act the mind has not the slightest evidence that its con-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 68.² *Ibid.*, p. 69.³ *Philosophical Basis of Theism*, p. 287.

struction has any resemblance to the external thing. Both authors seem to us mistaken in their theory of knowledge, yet correct in their conclusion that knowledge has no basis except on the supposition of theism.

We are glad to see that Professor Bowne makes the cosmological argument the starting-point in his treatise. Recent thinkers have been too chary of this argument, but the Bible tells us : "He that built all things is God." Proceeding from this starting-point, he reaches the conclusion that the world-ground is a unit. He then infers from the intelligibility of nature that the world-ground is intelligent, and, through various additional considerations, reaches this result : "We hold that the design argument, when the unity of the world-ground is given, proves far more conclusively the existence of mind in nature than it does the existence of mind in man. The two stand or fall together."¹

Personality is attributed to the world-ground thus : "That the ability to know itself and what it is doing (the author's definition of personality) should be denied to the ground and source of all power and knowledge is a denial so amazing as to require the best reasons to support it."² The objections to the personality of the source of all things are next considered and refuted, — yet not so clearly and directly as we could wish. The conclusion is, the world-ground is personal. This result illustrates the author's idea of a just ground of belief. His principle is : Believe all you can, all you desire, unless insuperable objections forbid it.

The author holds that God created the world by a free

¹ *Philosophy of Theism*, p. 111.

² *Ibid.*, p. 228.

act. He maintains that the finite is other than the infinite only as finite spirit, as a personal being ; hence "the cosmos contains two factors, elementary forms of action and laws for their combination,"¹ which are not other than the infinite, but are immediately dependent on God's will, and pass through their processes through his immanent energy. This relation of God to the world leads to the doctrine that the cosmos is controlled, and, if so, controlled for a purpose, since God is a person with intelligence and design. This necessitates the conclusion that the world-ground is ethical, for a government with design must have a goal, and that must be the supreme good.

The sum of the author's teaching cannot be better or more briefly given than in his own words : "Logic, then, is in its full right in pointing out the non-demonstrative character of these arguments, but it is miserably narrow when it fails to see that these undemonstrated ideals are still the foundation of our mental life. Without implicit faith in them no step can be taken in any field. . . . Of all these ideals that rule our life, theism is the sum and source. The cognitive ideal of the universe, as a manifestation of the Supreme Reason, leads to theism. The moral ideal of the universe, as a manifestation of the Supreme Righteousness, leads to theism. The practical ideal of a far-off divine event, to which the whole creation moves, leads to theism. In short, while theism is demonstrated by nothing, it is implicit in everything. It cannot be proved without begging the question, or denied without ending in absurdity. Poor atheism, on the other hand, first puts out its eyes by its primal unfaith in the truth of

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

our nature and of the system of things, and then proceeds to make a great many flourishes about 'reason,' 'science,' 'progress,' and the like, in melancholy ignorance of the fact that it has made all these impossible."¹

II. APOLOGETICS.

Ebrard's treatise on this subject we reserve to be noticed with the remaining volumes of his work, soon to be published in translation.

*Old Faiths in New Light.*²

This is a revised edition of a work published eight years ago. The author's aim is to show that our old religious beliefs may be retained notwithstanding the results of modern research. He holds that they may be held with fuller assurance than ever before, though in some instances in a modified form. He says in the preface of the first edition: "It has been my aim to meet what I believe to be a growing need of intelligent people, by gathering materials of faith which have been quarried by many specialists in their own departments of Biblical study or scientific research, but which, to a large extent, have been left by them in a disconnected and fragmentary state; and by endeavoring to put these results of recent scholarship together, according to one leading idea, in a modern construction of old faiths."³ The work is attractive for many reasons. The earnest Christian sentiment which

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

² *Old Faiths in New Light*, by Newman Smyth. Revised edition, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.

³ *Ibid.*, p. xxviii.

pervades it is evidence of the author's candor and devotion to truth. His high scholarship is evinced on almost every page. The ease with which he grasps recondite subjects gives indication of an intellect at once acute and strong. The facility with which he gives expression to subtle thought shows that ideas take a practical form before his mind. There are, however, some marks of youthful authorship which we wish he had eliminated from this revised edition. His wealth of expression, we think, sometimes obscures the thought; he sometimes mistakes rhetoric for logic and imagination for insight.

Dr. Smyth does not attempt to review the entire range of apologetics, but fixes upon a few cardinal points on which he would have his reader's faith confirmed. He says: "I shall endeavor to examine certain connected and strategic points along the line of defense of the Christian faith."¹ The points to which he principally turns his attention are two, the Bible and Christ; but these two may really be said to involve the entire system of evangelical religion. The light in which he examines these objects is *development*. He says in his preface to the revised edition: "In reviewing this book, after the lapse of several years, I find that there were three constructive principles which ran through the whole argument of it, viz.: an evolutionary science of nature, an educational philosophy of history, and a metaphysical faith in the spiritual unity of the creation."² He has, however, left in the text the following: "It is beyond question that the idea of development, in some form of it, is the dominant idea of modern thought. To the test of that prevalent and pow-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

² *Ibid.*, p. vii.

erful idea we are required to submit our most sacred spiritual and religious faiths. The Bible, Christianity, the hope of immortality, we shall bring under the light of this modern principle.”¹

Our author accepts the results of criticism concerning the composition and growth of the Old Testament, declines the defense of a doctrine of inspiration that would interfere with this view, or a doctrine that would make the Bible a “collection of oracular texts,” and admits that “we must read every Scripture in its own light, and interpret it in view of its own surroundings, and in its place in the gradual development of the Bible.”² He then raises the question whether the Bible can be accounted for by a merely natural development, or whether we must also admit an influence from above, the controlling force of a divine hand in its structure; and by one of the most convincing arguments in the entire work shows that it must be accepted as a revelation from God. He says in the preface to the revised edition: “The result of this whole critical endeavor to discover the actual facts, processes, and methods of the Spirit, in and through which the Bible came to be what it is, has already become apparent in a deeper, stronger, healthier faith in the Word of God among those who have entered humbly and honestly into these studies.”³

With much dissent from some of his views, we admit here a firm hold upon the doctrine of the divine authority of the Scriptures.

He attempts also to establish the divine authority of the Bible by its “relation to the educational method and work

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

² *Ibid.*, p. 43.

³ *Ibid.*, p. xxv.

of God in human history." He assumes that the development of history has as its law of progress a divine purpose, and as its goal the greatest possible moral good. If the Bible is from God it must be in coincidence with this fundamental principle. "The supreme moral test of the Bible therefore is, Does it flow with and increase this diviner current of history?" He considers that it vindicates itself triumphantly by this test, that it shows itself to be a superhuman work by its moral leadership in the world. He finds in the Scriptures a plain progress in doctrine from without inward, from law to love. He also finds an advance in its educational methods and forces. Revelation gives us higher and higher views of God as it advances, it constantly enhances the value of the family, it abolishes evils, such as human sacrifices and slavery, in its progress, and induces a growing hope of immortality. Moreover, the Bible furnishes us the test by which we are to try it. We find in its earlier portions ideas which we find it difficult to reconcile with our moral feelings because the Bible has itself elevated and refined our moral feelings. For such reasons as these the author considers himself entitled to infer that the development of revelation is evidence that its source is above nature. This argument, however some of its details might be criticised, is valuable as avoiding many objections that might be brought to some of the narratives of the Bible taken singly.

The author, after noticing the signs of supernatural evolution in the Bible and in history, especially the history of Israel, attempts to follow up this evolution to its completion in Jesus Christ. Here he seems to us to go beyond anything required by his subject. No one can object to his turning the light of evolution on the Bible

and on history for the sake of examining them with his microscope or other optical glasses, but it seems to us a bold undertaking to put Christ under this new light and a bold claim to profess to have discovered Christ under this light independently of any other revelation. But this is not overstating the author's claim. After portraying skillfully the uniqueness of Christ, he says: "The life of Jesus, unnatural and inconceivable on any other hypothesis, becomes natural and conceivable the moment we regard it as the development of an incarnation."¹ . . . "We believe the uniqueness of Christ to be but the half truth of history; the naturalness of the incarnation is the whole truth of the creation."² It is not to be supposed that Christ is reached by following the development of *history* simply, we are told that we must go to *natural science* for facts bearing on this topic, and two facts are cited as of importance; the first is the gradual ascent of life, the other is a tendency to "more highly organized specific and individual forms." So we are permitted to rise from the frog to the ape, from the ape to man, from man to Christ. "If the momentum of life makes the birth of man possible, so that a being possessed of sufficient intelligence, in some earlier geological age, might have confidently predicted man's coming at some future time: so equally the momentum of the creative purpose makes possible the introduction of a reign beyond the kingdom of man, so that before Christ came in the flesh a superior intelligence might have read from the succession of life on the earth, and the advance of human history, a prophecy of the day of the Messiah."³

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 243.² *Ibid.*, p. 244.³ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

We have not space to follow the author's speculations further, but it should be noticed that he brings the resurrection under the evolutionary process. Christ, after he left the tomb, spent a few days on the border-land of the seen and unseen, and thus gave the disciples a demonstration of the truth that the natural state passes into the spiritual. "The spiritual body shall be the end of God's way through nature to a glorified creation."¹

We have two or three remarks to make concerning the work which we have now noticed:—

1. It has always been considered questionable whether the existence of God could be fairly inferred from the existence of the world and processes of nature. The right to go out of nature for a cause of nature, in following the line of cause and effect, has been doubted. We think Dr. Smyth can expect but few to follow him in the other direction and reach to the vision of God's existence by the development of nature. A God thus reached can only be nature perfected; a Christ thus reached cannot be the supramundane God, can only be the God of Pantheism. But Dr. Smyth's Christ really seems not God, but the universe purified and made as good as God.

2. We do not see that Dr. Smyth holds to the doctrine of the Trinity, or to the eternal Sonship of Christ according to the view that he exists as the Second Person of the Trinity by a necessity of the Divine Nature. We are here told that "the Son, the perfection of God's glory, is the necessary, the eternal will of the Father."² The best we can make of this is, the Father is constrained to achieve his highest glory through a creation which culmi-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 363.

² *Ibid.*, p. 285.

nates in the incarnation of deity, that incarnation being the Son; but perhaps we do not interpret correctly.

3. Dr. Smyth really sets aside his evolution light as of little worth when he comes to interpret it. Its need of interpretation shows that it is not wholly light with no darkness at all, and in the interpretation he falls back on the old common methods in use in apologetic literature. He finds in the human soul the need of a Messiah, — a need manifested in a tendency to worship and in other ways, and infers that “in proportion as the words of the disciples, ‘All men seek for thee,’ can be proved to express the desire of the nations — in that proportion the Christ necessity, or the constitutional Messianic need of mankind, becomes the prophecy and pledge of its own ultimate satisfaction,” — a common, as we think somewhat valid, but much ridiculed method of argumentation, and not at all evolutionary.

Another means of interpreting the evolution light is the love of God. The author assumes the following principle, “The self-imparting energy of love is the first cause of the creation. The divine love must create, because to give of its own being and life is of the very nature of love. The creation is throughout, from beginning to end, a giving of self, a self-imparting act of God.” So he is compelled to take a position from which he can see the beginning and end before he can interpret the process — the evolution. Evolution, therefore, serves only as a means of confirmatory evidence in theology, and can of itself establish nothing new. This we believe to be the true position, though the word love seems to us improperly used.¹

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 268–280.

4. While Dr. Smyth makes dextrous use of evolution in some of his arguments, he really argues at other times from the limitation and weakness of evolution. This he does when he bases his argument for the divine authority of the Bible on conscience and moral freedom. He says: "Keen observers have noticed the existence of what they call an anti-Darwinian conscience in man. There is an invisible something in man which oftens sets at defiance and prevails over the inherited tendencies of human nature, and which does not always give the battle to the strong. Whence came and of what manner of spirit is this *anti-historic* power in Israel and the Bible?"¹ Here the author shows that there must have been a divine design fulfilled by a divine power in the production of the religious faith and religious writings of Israel, because these stood in absolute contradiction to natural developments. The processes of nature and the educational processes of history, in Israel and out of Israel, all ran the other way, therefore there must have been a power from heaven interposing to secure the result which we see. Now, however he may apply the term evolution to the advance in revelation from age to age, he is obliged to assume conscience and moral freedom as starting-points, both of which are above evolution and independent of it.

*The Miraculous Element in the Gospels.*²

This work is a course of lectures delivered in Union Theological Seminary, on the Ely Foundation. The author, Alexander Balmain Bruce, D.D., is Professor of

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

² *The Miraculous Element in the Gospels.* By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D.D., New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son.

Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis in Free Church College, Glasgow. We have here a body of thought which should command the attention of students in theology and preachers throughout the country. It is of the greater value in its support of the fact of miracles because of the strongly critical tendency of the author's mind, and because of his disapproval, in some respects, of the ordinary doctrine concerning miracles. He accepts the reality of miracles as beyond question ; in the use he makes of them he differs with many of the Christian apologists.

He announces his belief that the narratives of the miracles belong to the Gospels in this way : "The miraculous element in the Gospels is no mere excrescence or external adjunct easily separable from the body of the history, but an essential portion of it, closely woven into the fabric, vitally connected with the organism."¹ He makes out, allowing for possible duplicates, "thirty narratives of events ostensibly miraculous " in the four Gospels. But if some of these should be considered later additions, he still finds eleven that are common to the Synoptists, and must be accepted as belonging to the primitive Gospel, if there were such a work at the basis of the three. Or if any one holds to the *Logia* of Matthew as the earliest Christian document, this, he thinks, must have contained at least six of the eleven miracles above referred to.² These six are all of a marked and unmistakable character, so that there is no possibility of eliminating the miraculous element from the Gospels. Moreover, these narratives are not proof of the late origin or unapostolic source of the Gospels ; on the other hand, the author finds

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

² *Ibid.*, p. 108.

in the miracle-histories and in the discourses of the Gospels "the unmistakable stamp of apostolic inspiration." The buoyancy of style and spontaneity of expression pervading these narratives show that they belong to the original and creative epoch of Christian history.¹

Prof. Bruce looks upon these miracles as veritable miracles, not simply events which excited the wonder of spectators at the time of their occurrence. He says: "Miracles are not the effects of partially or wholly unknown physical causes; they are produced by immediate divine causality."² His replies to certain attempts to bring them within the range of natural operations are very acute and satisfactory. Some say, the order of nature is only an irrational assumption, has no other basis than an impulse or instinct of man (and of animals also), therefore a miracle is not to be rejected as irrational on the ground that it does not accord with the order of nature. To this he replies, then a miracle is of no account and not worth defending. There must be an order of nature above which a miracle rises, or it has no evidential value. Some say, miracles fall within the range of nature, but are due to the effect of a higher, unknown law. This view, it is supposed, makes the idea of miracles less offensive to scientific minds. The author replies, adopting here the reply of others, if there are two conflicting laws, the miracle is in holding one in suspense. If the higher law is, the dead rise, and the lower, they do not rise, the miracle is, now that they remain dead, and now that they come to life. He says of this view: "This hypothesis, equally with the attempt to base the defense of miracles

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 108-111.

² *Ibid.*, p. 66.

on the irrationality of the belief in the fixed order of nature (its exact opposite), saves miracles as events by the sacrifice of their miraculous significance. The extremes meet at this point.”¹ Some, again, consider the miracles of the Gospels merely *relative* miracles, wonderful events because those who witnessed them did not know to what to ascribe them, while yet they were to be ascribed to forces in nature. The healings of Christ were the effects of certain moral or magnetic powers which he was able to wield, and which, in the course of time, others may learn to wield. Moral therapeutics may sometime become an established science. To this the author replies, after admitting its plausibility in some cases, it is not possible to verify this hypothesis in any case, and “to a certain class of Gospel miracles the hypothesis of relative miraculousness is not applicable — those wrought on nature, such as the multiplication of the loaves, and the change of water into wine.”²

Prof. Bruce has some interesting remarks on the source of the power by which Christ’s miracles were wrought, but seems not perfectly settled in his own mind. “The miracle-power of Jesus is usually conceived as a natural faculty resident in him, which he used at will as ordinary men use their power of walking or practising a handicraft or playing on an instrument. In favor of it (this view) is the constant, habitual use of the power in works of healing; also some of the phrases employed to describe its exercise. . . . There are, however, other things which suggest the idea of a power not indwelling but transcendent, called into play by the prayers and faith of Jesus.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

² *Ibid.*, p. 56.

He represented himself as casting out devils by the finger of God. He looked up to heaven before working one cure, as if recognizing the source of his strength; he thanked his Father for hearing his prayer in connection with another."¹

Christ's motive in working miracles is an important topic. The author conceives it to have been, in most cases, his love of the human race. He thinks Jesus came to the consciousness of his Messiahship through this same love. When he accepted his call to the office of the Messiah, he took on him the infirmities of his brethren and healed their diseases. There were, however, some miracles—Dr. Bruce calls them nature-miracles—which were wrought for the sake of exhibiting the nature of the kingdom of God. These last had a higher aim than the more immediately beneficent works of our Lord.

Our author seems to us much more able as a Professor of exegesis than as a Professor of apologetics. His treatment of miracles, in their connection with the evidences of Christianity, we consider not only weak but self-contradictory. A miracle being, as he maintains, an immediate work of God, those who witness it, or those who are convinced of its reality, may both look from it to its source, to God, and ask, what does He mean, and look to the physical effect, and ask what it means. But its meaning, at the lowest interpretation, carries with it the divine authority, in addition to anything contained in the miracle as merely an object of observation. The author, however, finds the divine intent of most of the miracles in

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

their beneficent effects, from Christ's good works the disciples learned to know him. The ordinary view of miracles he characterizes as "artificial and superficial."¹ In taking this position, we believe, he loses all the essential force of miracles as connected with the Christian system. In his attempt to interpret the nature-miracles, as that of the *stater* and that of cursing the fig-tree, he shows himself as incapable as ordinary men are of "requiring them to possess characteristics congruous to the nature of the revelation with which they are associated." He virtually confesses that they are not such as he would have performed, and shows clearly that he finds it quite a task to make out their meaning. The miracles of healing seem more to his purpose; but, in commenting on their value, he overturns the structure which he has himself erected, in this way: "Whether they be miracles in the strict sense, or only marvels, or not even so much as marvels, they serve the purpose of making manifest the sympathy of Christ equally well. Their lesson is independent of all theories as to how they happened. . . . Look at them as you will, these works of healing are a revelation of grace."² The miracles are, without doubt, instructive in many ways; are, as the author happily styles them, in some cases miracle-parables: but this element is incidental; if they are not evidence of the presence of God, of his direct interposition, they are of no account as miracles. Even a bare miracle, if perfectly authenticated, would show some things not shown by healing a sick man without miracle. Matthew Arnold's supposition of changing a pen into a pen-wiper, if actually realized, would

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 291-293.

² *Ibid.*, p. 305.

prove something. If either he or the Professor will try it, they may find the effect greater than they suppose.

But our author, after teaching that most of the miracles are worthless, except as vehicles of revelation, adopts them as the only sufficient evidence of the divine authorship of the religion of Jesus. He says: "We have next to inquire how far the religion of Jesus himself is likely to survive the complete elimination of the miraculous from his history and person." After a brief but very comprehensive description of this religion, he proceeds: "A beautiful creed, and good for him [Christ], and good for all who can hold it. But there is the difficulty. Believers in miracle can take it on his word, and successfully resist all temptations to doubt arising from whatever in nature or in experience seems to give the lie to its cardinal propositions; for in Christ they recognize an infallible guide in all matters pertaining to religion and morals. But with miracle the infallible guide disappears, and there remains only a man with very charming views about God, man, and the universe. . . . When miracle has been finally got rid of, the order of the day will be, Let him follow the religion of Jesus who can."¹

There is much more to be said in favor of this book, but we have not space. Lecture IX. is an admirable presentation of the character of Christ. There are some things to be said in disapproval of the last lecture, able and instructive as it is. The last two pages seem to us to make against rather than for Christianity. But every page of the work is worthy of a careful perusal.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

*Christian Evidence.*¹

This little manual is a work of marked value. It contains, in brief, the argument of his Bampton Lectures, and is free from some of the sentiments which mar that work. In speaking of the means to be adopted for the defense of Christianity, he happily denominates "the historical truth of the person, work, and teaching of Jesus Christ our Lord, as it is depicted in the Gospels," *the key of the position*. He argues the divine mission of Christ from the indubitable facts of present daily observation, and, we think, with much cogency. In commenting on our Lord's assertion, "I am the light of the world," he says: "If he is, at the present moment, the source of the moral and spiritual illumination of all the progressive races of mankind, then he must have possessed a superhuman insight into the history of the future. Thus a saying which to all his contemporaries, except an inconsiderable number of disciples, must have seemed the height of fanatical presumption, and which must have taxed to the utmost the faith of his friends, is now the strongest evidence that his mission is from God, and that he himself is a manifestation of the divine in the sphere of the human."²

The author deserves much credit for the place he gives to the epistles of St. Paul in Christian evidences, and for his refutation of the adverse theories concerning the resurrection of our Lord.

¹ *Manual of Christian Evidence*. By Prebendary Row. New York, Thomas Whittaker, 1887.

² *Ibid.*, p. 30.

III. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

*The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.*¹

This work consists of the Bampton Lectures, "preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1886." Its aim is historical, but it is also of interest for us because of its treatment of certain Christian doctrines. Especially at this time, when some theologians would ignore Latin theology and lead us directly back to the Greek system of Christian thought, is such a treatise as the present worthy of attention. The Christian Platonists whose speculations are brought before us are Clement of Alexandria and Origen. The period through which their lives extended, from 150 to 254 A.D., is one of the most interesting centuries of church history. They were contemporaries for about twenty-eight years. Origen was precocious, and was undoubtedly greatly influenced by Clement, though they could not have been intimately associated for any great length of time. The thoughts of two such men at such a time are among the most valuable treasures of church history. In their day the canonicity of some of the books of the New Testament was under discussion, the polity of the church was undergoing transformations; in Clement's time a bishop was not yet distinguished from a presbyter, the value of Paul's teaching was a subject of debate, and his reputation was suffering because of the character of his friends, — the Gnostics, — the relation of Christianity to learning was unsettled, and whether gnosticism would capture the Church was not yet decided.

¹ *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.* By Charles Bigg, D.D. Macmillan & Co., 1886, New York.

The thoughts of a Christian scholar when the Christian teachings had not yet been expressed in the language of the schools, of a scholar surrounded by Stoics and Platonists, and under the immediate influence of Philo's teachings, must always be of permanent value. The lectures before us do not impress us as being characterized by perfect unity of aim, perhaps the subject forbids it, — but they are eminently entertaining, and exhibit abundant ability to treat the various themes involved in the historical narrative. A few points of interest may be noticed. The author considers that Clement adopted a heathen idea of God, and then held that all we know of him is through the revelation of the Son. God is the pure Monad without any relations, to whom no predicates can be applied. The Son is wisdom, knowledge, truth. The unknown powers of the divine nature appear in him, and he is the All. "The Son in this Pythagorean mode of statement is the circle, of which the Father is the central point. He is the ideal Many, the Mind, of which the Father is the principle of identity. He is, in fact, the consciousness of God."¹ Clement regarded the Holy Spirit as a distinct hypostasis, and held the doctrine of the trinity, undoubtedly, in some form, but the elaboration of this theme was then in the future. He ascribed the inspiration of the prophets to the Holy Spirit, also the combination of the church into a unity. He accepted the incarnation of the Logos, yet did not consider it the means by which Christ became a sacrifice for sin, but rather the means by which he attaches himself to men, and raises them to a participation in the divine nature.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

He was always the source of light to the world, the power that transformed men from savages to citizens of the State, but as incarnate he is our redemption — redemption being elevation to a divine state above that possible to human nature of itself. He rejected the Gnostic idea that matter is the source of evil, did not believe in hereditary depravity, and explained the existence of sin by the freedom of the human will. "There can, I think, be no doubt (though it has been doubted) that Clement allowed the possibility of repentance and amendment till the Last Day."¹

Dr. Bigg finds Origen a much more stern and "far-sighted" man than Clement. He "could not rest content with an easy optimism like that of Clement, who stopped short at the assertion of the unity of divine justice and goodness. For there was that in Scripture which appeared to him irreconcilable with both."² We cannot notice the many points of Origen's character and doctrine which our author brings to view, for there is no one central idea to which they may be traced, but will merely single out for notice one or two items of interest. He did not conceive of God as a personified abstraction, after the manner of Clement, but considered him equable and calm, patient and merciful, not a being who indulged wrath or inflicted punishment. Punishment he supposed to be simply the natural consequence of sin. Subordinationism is a term associated with Origen. In reference to it Bigg says: "We shall, however, wrong Origen if we attempt to derive his subordinationism from metaphysical considerations. It is purely Scriptural, and rests wholly

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

² *Ibid.*, p. 138.

and entirely upon the words of Jesus, 'My Father is greater than I,' 'that they may know thee the only true God,' 'none is good save One.' The dominant text in Origen's mind was the last. . . . To his dauntless spirit these words of the Master seemed to be not a scandal but a flash of light. They spoke of the supreme anchor of all our hopes, the transcendental goodness of Him from whom all things ultimately proceed, of that day when Christ shall render up his kingdom to the Father, and God the Good shall be all in all."¹ The many-sidedness of Origen is brought to view in remarks on his commentary on Solomon's Song. "And thus Origen, the first pioneer in so many fields of Christian thought, the father in one of his many aspects of the English Latitudinarians, became also the spiritual ancestor of Bernard, the Victorines, and the author of the *De Imitatione*, of Tauler and Molinos, and Madame de Guyon."²

One of the most interesting portions of these lectures is that which treats of reformed paganism. It is not in place here to notice the attempts in the second century to purify the heathen religions and to make them equal to Christianity, the attempts to teach a providential government by the aid of demons, and to bring forward a rival of Jesus in Apollonius of Tyana; but we may give a moment's attention to Celsus and Origen's reply to him. Celsus wrote towards the close of the second century. He was "an enlightened advocate of the reformed paganism." He believed in the existence of one Supreme God, who created the lower deities and the human soul. Lower deities created the world. He could not accept

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 181, 183.

² *Ibid.*, p. 188.

Christianity, because it taught that God created the world, because it rejected demons, or the lower deities, and especially because it taught the incarnation of God. He could not accept an alliance between holy God and corrupt matter. He criticised the Bible with great severity, pointing out "the mistakes of Moses," the folly of the Gospels, and the utter failure of Jesus to make good his claims.

The reply of Origen, made fifty years after Celsus wrote, is of interest as showing what were then looked upon as the evidences of Christianity. He denied that Christ had failed, and pointed in proof to the churches springing up on every side. "The argument from the fulfilment of prophecy he considered as among the greatest of all the evidences. But the one crowning proof of the truth of the Gospel, the miracle of all miracles, was the Christian life and the Christian society."¹

*Systematic Theology.*²

"This work is an enlarged and amended edition of the author's 'Lectures on Theology,' printed in 1876." The present edition, like the former, is intended as a handbook for students, rather than a discussion of Christian doctrines. It consists of the notes of a teacher gathered in lecturing to successive classes in a theological seminary. The work is one of marked excellences; it treats all the principal doctrines of Christian theology with

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

² *Systematic Theology*, A Compendium and Commonplace Book Designed for the Use of Theological Students, by Augustus Hopkins Strong, D.D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary. Rochester, Press of E. R. Andrews, 1886.

acuteness, discrimination, and a fair degree of fulness. Some doctrines the author dwells upon *con amore*, and, though he gives his work the unambitious title *Common-place Book*, he has, in some cases, added to the current views his own carefully formed opinions. The book is provided with a very full table of contents, which spreads before the eye, for easy comprehension, the entire course of thought, and closes with indexes amounting to one hundred and fifty pages, by which any item in the six hundred pages constituting the body of the work may be readily found. It is, therefore, in reality, a theological dictionary as well as hand-book. The student will readily inform himself on almost any topic of theology by turning to these pages.

The spirit that pervades the book can be spoken of with high commendation; it is conservative but not timid, neither repelled nor captivated by novelties. The references evince a wide range of reading. In some cases the influence of German speculation upon the author's mind is obvious; in many instances, works of philosophy and even of fiction are laid under contribution to express or illustrate theologic thought. Scores of times the reader wishes he could carry ever ready in his memory apt remarks or quotations like this from Berkeley: "The universe is God's ceaseless conversation with his creatures."

The remarks on the existence of God are very clear, though we could not assent to every statement; the chapter on the attributes of God is very discriminating and manifests patient thought upon a topic of late too much neglected. It is hardly too much to say that in the chapter on *the works of God, or the execution of the decrees*, every line exhibits patient and protracted study. The

number of different topics here treated is worthy of remark, the rapidity of the progress from point to point relieves the reader of tedium and makes every page readable. On some topics we could have desired a little greater fulness; inspiration, miracles, the deity of Christ may be noticed as themes in connection with which this feeling rises. On the deity of Christ, however, the argumentation is fresh and forcible. If positive and intense conviction on the part of a teacher could always secure assent on the part of pupils, every member of Professor Strong's classes would come out an immersionist. We think he rather overdoes the matter. When he traces the Unitarian defection in New England to infant baptism, one is inclined to ask why he does not go a step further and trace it to Christianity.

The author has given special attention to the will, to sin, and to the atonement, and his treatment of them deserves more careful notice. It is especially from the views of sin here advocated that this work will derive its reputation; but with this theme theories concerning the other two are of course involved.

The author makes our responsibility rest upon the freedom of the will, and freedom consists in the power of avoidability or contrary choice. He rejects the freedom of indifference on the one hand and determinism on the other. He says: "We therefore part company with Jonathan Edwards and his *Treatise on the Freedom of the Will*, as well as with the younger Edwards, Alexander and Charles Hodge, all of whom follow Jonathan Edwards, in identifying sensibility with the will, in regarding affections as the causes of volitions, and in speaking of the connection between motives and action as a necessary

one. We hold, on the contrary, that sensibility and will are two distinct powers ; that affections are occasions, but never causes of volitions, and that, while motives may infallibly persuade, they never compel the will. The power to make the decision other than it is resides in the will, though it may never be exercised." ¹ Still, he holds that ability is not the measure of obligation, and that we are responsible for what we are, as well as for what we do, — for the disposition to do, as well as for the deed. "Ability to fulfil the law is not essential to constitute the non-fulfilment sin." ² To the objection, "that man cannot be responsible for a sinful nature which he did not personally originate," he replies : "The objection ignores the testimony of conscience and of Scripture. These assert that we are responsible for what we are. The sinful nature is not something external to us, but is our inmost selves." ³ "Whether this evil will is the result of personal transgression, or is a hereditary bias derived from generations past, this evil will is the man himself, and upon him terminates the blame." ⁴ What seems at first view an inconsistency is reconciled by the view of humanity which he adopts. He considers that all men were present in Adam, had part in his fall, and are guilty with him in the first transgression. He says : "The aim of all the theories [of imputation] is to find a decision of the will which will justify God in condemning men. . . . We claim that the theory of Augustine — that of a sin of the race in Adam — is the only one that shows a conscious transgression, fit to be the cause and ground of man's guilt and condemnation." ⁵ In this act Adam was free to

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

² *Ibid.*, p. 289.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 335.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 285.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 322.

the fullest extent, and we free with him. "Reason, therefore, has no other recourse than to accept the Scripture doctrine that sin originated in man's free act of revolt from God, — the act of a will which, though inclined toward God, was not yet confirmed in virtue, and was still capable of a contrary choice. The original possession of such a power to the contrary seems to be the necessary condition of probation and moral development."¹ Our freedom is, in part, lost in the fall, but not our responsibility. "The power of contrary choice which Adam had exists no longer in its entirety; it is narrowed down to a power to the contrary in temporary and subordinate choices; it no longer is equal to the work of changing the fundamental determination of the being to selfishness as an ultimate end. Yet for this very inability, because originated by will, man is responsible."² "If a basis for man's responsibility and guilt be sought, it must be found, if at all, not in his plenary ability, his gracious ability, or his natural ability, but in his *original* ability, when he came, in Adam, from the hands of his Maker."³ The author has studied long over the will, — its nature and its action, — but we doubt if he has relieved the subject of any of its difficulties. It is not easy to understand how the will can be any more free at one time than at another, more free as a holy will than as a sinful will, be a *will* and not be free. The attempt to trace back moral action to a point when the will carried with it the least possible character, and was nearest to a choice from a state of indifference, affords no aid in accounting for will-action. If all character is eliminated, there can be no choice; if *any* bias re-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 304.² *Ibid.*, p. 317.³ *Ibid.*, p. 343.

mains, the difficulty of reconciling responsibility with a foregone decision remains.

The author defines sin thus : "Sin is lack of conformity to the moral law of God, either in act, disposition, or state."¹ His view of original sin is involved in his theory concerning the will, which has been already noticed. He lays it down as a fundamental principle, "That God's moral government is a government which not only takes account of persons and personal acts, but also recognizes race-responsibilities and inflicts race-penalties; or, in other words, judges mankind, not simply as a collection of separate individuals, but also as an organic whole, which can collectively revolt from God and incur the curse of his violated law."² Accordingly he affirms, "Adam's sin is the cause and ground of the depravity, guilt, and condemnation of all his posterity, simply because Adam and his posterity are one, and, by virtue of their organic unity, the sin of Adam is the sin of the race."³ He admits that responsibility for our evil disposition can be maintained only on the ground that it is caused "by an original and conscious act of free will;" holds that actual sin is more guilty than original sin alone, and holds that, because of the atonement, no one is finally condemned because of original sin. He teaches also that we are not responsible for the sins of our ancestors, but simply for the one act in which the race fell from its integrity. "The apostasy of human nature could occur but once." "No merely personal qualities, whether of guilt or righteousness, are communicated by propagation. Ordinary generation does not transmit *personal* qualities, but only those qualities

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

² *Ibid.*, p. 309.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 308.

which belong to the whole species.”¹ He teaches also that the personal will of each individual has a degree of freedom, so that his moral character is not a simple development of the inherited disposition. Each man has a personal probation “in addition to the race-probation in Adam.” This personal probation does not present an alternative between righteousness and sin, but only between a less and a greater degree of sinfulness.

We have often wished that we could adopt this theory, and put an end to all further questions as to sin and guilt. But the objections to it seem insuperable. It is easy to say that the race can fall but once, but this does not prove that all subsequent sins are cut off from transmission. Does the apostasy destroy the organic life union of the race? if not, it is as good a basis for the transmission of *any* sin as of the first. Again, it is palpably contrary to facts that personal qualities do not descend from parents to children. The fact that consciousness and reason give evidence in favor of race-guilt and race-responsibility is not so clear as to carry general conviction with it. An insuperable objection to the view is that it cannot be brought into accord with Romans v. 14 — “Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.” Paul says the sin of those between Adam and Moses, because of which they are subject to death, was not similar to that of Adam; the Augustinian says it was identically the same. Do the two mean the same thing? It can be so interpreted; the sun is not *like* the sun, it *is* the sun. Did Paul take this method of dividing mankind

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 336, 337.

into three classes, — Adam, his posterity before the giving of the law, and his posterity after the law; and then say of the second class, its sin was not like that of the first, in order to say that the three classes committed jointly one sin in Adam? Andrews and Stoddard wrote a Latin grammar. They worked over it till neither of them could tell which part belonged to himself, which to the other. Suppose the publisher in advertising the book should say: “I call attention to a new Latin grammar this day published, prepared by Prof. E. A. Andrews. I also call attention to a Latin grammar prepared by Prof. Solomon Stoddard, not like that of Prof. Andrews.” Who would suppose only one book was published? Would the authors be quite satisfied if the publisher should reply to any remonstrance they might make, by saying: “That is my way of expressing identity”? One should hesitate before making Paul a quibbler. The strength of the Augustinian theory is that, when once admitted, it helps to solve a good many difficulties. Moreover, if it is necessary to have a theory, it is difficult to find one to take its place. But we can accept facts without being responsible for theories. We are inclined to think that the view that men are lost as they are saved, — by faith, is as good as any. They are lost by faith in Adam, — the old Adam in themselves, if one chooses, and are saved by faith in Christ. This is as Scriptural as Augustinism. It is of no account to say that men are lost before they are men. Augustinism has been supposed to present a profound view of human nature, but this is no commendation unless it is a true view. It is possible that a fuller knowledge of human consciousness will reveal a unity of the race through faith as profound as that proposed by the doctrine of traducianism.

Dr. Strong adopts the expiatory view of the atonement. He considers that Christ suffered the penalty of the law in our behalf, and that for this reason we can be delivered from punishment if we avail ourselves of his atonement. He says: "The atonement is therefore a satisfaction of the ethical demands of the divine nature, by the substitution of Christ's penal sufferings for the punishment of the guilty. This substitution is unknown to mere law, and above and beyond the powers of law. It is an operation of grace. Grace, however, does not violate or suspend law, but takes it up into itself and fulfils it. The righteousness of law is maintained, in that the source of all law, the judge and punisher, himself voluntarily submits to bear the penalty, and bears it in the human nature that has sinned." ¹

To the objection, "That the sufferings of Christ, as finite in time, do not constitute a satisfaction to the infinite demands of the law," he replies: "The infinite dignity of the sufferer constitutes his sufferings a full equivalent, in the eye of infinite justice. Substitution excludes identity of suffering; it does not exclude equivalence." ² The availability of Christ's sufferings in our behalf is explained by imputation. Imputation is a cardinal doctrine with our author, and we will quote a statement which applies to the present case, and in fact presents the entire scheme. Speaking of justification, he says: "Here we have the third instance of imputation. The first was the imputation of Adam's sin to us; and the second was the imputation of our sins to Christ. The third is now the imputation of Christ's righteousness to us. Adam's sin

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 410.

² *Ibid.*, p. 420.

is imputed to us, because we are one with Adam ; our sins are imputed to Christ, because Christ is one with humanity. So here we must hold that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, because we are one with Christ." ¹ Accordingly, Christ could make atonement for the race because he was of it, one with humanity, one who might properly take on himself the sins of the world. "The ethical theory of the atonement holds that Christ stands in such a relation to humanity that what God's holiness demands Christ is under obligation to pay, longs to pay, inevitably does pay, and pays so fully, in virtue of his twofold nature, that every claim of justice is satisfied, and the sinner who accepts what Christ has done in his behalf is saved." ²

This view of the atonement the author maintains in the usual way by exposition of certain passages of the Scriptures, but in addition to this he resorts to a philosophical exposition which seems somewhat remarkable. He teaches that Christ was guilty of Adam's sin, and deserved to be punished for it ; that he carried that guilt through life, and expiated it upon the cross. He bore the punishment which he deserved when he died. He, however, was never guilty of any personal transgression, because he was from the first free from any *pollution* in connection with original sin. "If Christ had been born into the world by ordinary generation, he too would have had depravity, guilt, penalty. But he was not so born. In the womb of the Virgin, the human nature which he took was purged of its depravity. But this purging away of depravity did not take away guilt or penalty. There was still left the just exposure to the penalty of violated law. Although Christ's

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 479.

² *Ibid.*, p. 412.

nature was purified, his obligation to suffer yet remained. He might have declined to join himself to humanity, and then he need not have suffered. But once born of the Virgin, once possessed of the human nature that was under the curse, he was bound to suffer. The whole mass and weight of God's displeasure against the race fell on him, when once he became a member of the race."¹ "Christ became responsible for the humanity with which he was organically one."² One is inclined to ask how, then, his suffering could pay the penalty for the sins of others if he deserved to suffer on his own account. We have the reply in these words: "The mystery of the atonement lies in the fact of unmerited sufferings on the part of Christ."³ And to the objection, "That the sufferings of Christ, as finite in time, do not constitute a satisfaction to the infinite demands of the law," he replies: "The infinite dignity of the sufferer constitutes his sufferings a full equivalent, in the eye of infinite justice."⁴ One feels inclined to ask the author, then, to draw the line between the deserved and the undeserved sufferings of Christ, and to ask if the atoning pains do not begin at that line, and if the punishment inflicted on Christ for his part in original sin should not be left wholly out of the account. It is difficult to see how Christ's suffering for his own guilt in any way prepared him to suffer for the guilt of others, unless it is also held that the entire humanity of the race fairly paid its penalty when one suffered, as all incurred the penalty when one sinned. But if that is the case then all men should be saved from the penalty, humanity as a whole being redeemed. This does not seem

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 412.² *Ibid.*, p. 419.³ *Ibid.*, p. 419.⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 420.

to be the view of the author, though he apparently hovers around that idea. He teaches that the incarnation is the fulfilment of the idea of humanity, that Christ restores the lost image of God to man by uniting himself to humanity, that Christ assumed the penalty of the sin of the race, and secured an objective reconciliation between it and God. It would seem from this that, at the least, no one should be punished for original sin. And if our guilt for this cause of subsequent sin were removed, it would be natural to ask if the guilt of the necessary effect should not be removed. He admits that it is unjust to hold us guilty of the effect, if we be not first guilty of the cause.¹ With this view the sinner would be punishable only for avoidable sins within the remainders of his range of freedom. The author's tendency to a realistic philosophy appears further in his view of the Christian life. He says: "The life of Christ which makes us Christians is the same life which made atonement upon the cross, and which rose from the grave for justification."² He here looks upon the life of Christ not as a consideration having legal value, but as a vital force entering into the life of men. "But Christ's new humanity is the germinal source of spiritual life for the race. He was justified, not simply as a private person, but as our representative and head. By becoming partakers of the new life in him, we share in all he is, and in all he has done; and, first of all, we share in his justification."³

There seems to us danger that such speculations will displace faith and the work of the Holy Spirit from their proper positions in the Christian system. Another inquiry which

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 327.

² *Ibid.*, p. 340.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 479.

Dr. Strong's theology suggests is this : How could Christ inherit the guilt of Adam's first sin? Other men inherit it because they are in possession, so he holds, of wills that had part in the act of the race-will in the first transgression, but our author adopts the Monothelitic view, that Christ had no human will, consequently he could have had no part in the original sin. We would also ask, if Christ was purged of pollution before his soul was individualized, and if he had no will, how he represents humanity? and if he could not sin as man (having no will), how he could condemn sin in the flesh?

But whatever the questions we may desire to ask, we can very cordially commend the work before us as a valuable hand-book for all theological students.

*The New Man.*¹

A good treatise on regeneration is very much needed. The topic is not now before the public in such a way that it can be treated at any considerable length in CURRENT DISCUSSIONS, but we believe it will soon become a theme of wide-spread interest. The fact of regeneration is denied by some; by others regeneration seems to be made a literal new creation. There are some indications that the former view, the denial of regeneration, may become quite prevalent in this country. The work before us treats of the new man,—his home, his birth, his meat, his divine nature, etc., in a way to interest and instruct the reader, but not in such a way as to be of strictly scientific value. The method of argumentation is too fanciful to be of avail

¹ *The New Man and the Eternal Life: Notes on the Reiterated Amens of the Son of God.* By Andrew Jukes, fifth edition, New York, Thomas Whittaker, 1887.

with those who doubt the reality of regeneration. Our Lord's use of the expression "verily, verily" served rather, as it seems to us, to emphasize practical duties than to explain recondite doctrine.

The publisher of the above work is importing for sale in this country the Theological Library of Hodder and Stoughton, London. We take great pleasure in commending these little volumes to our readers, not because they fall within the range of the main purpose of CURRENT DISCUSSIONS, but because they are contributions of real value to those theological discussions which are of perennial interest. The volumes before us amply fulfil the promise of the publishers: "These volumes will be condensed in expression, biblical in doctrine, catholic in spirit, and by competent writers."

The first volume of the series, *Does Science aid Faith in regard to Creation?* by the Rt. Rev. Henry Cotterill, Bishop of Edinburgh, is one of which it is difficult to speak in terms of too high praise. A book of two hundred and twenty-eight pages cannot exhaust such a theme, but the author shows himself a master both in theology and science, and has packed into the work all it can possibly hold. The other volumes before us are: *Are Miracles Credible?* by Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A.; *Is God Knowable?* by Rev. J. Iverach, M.A.; *Is Christ Divine?* by Rev. T. Whitelaw, M.A. These volumes do not, perhaps, give the evidence of an overwhelming wealth of material such as we find in the work by the Bishop of Edinburgh, but exhibit a mastery of the themes discussed, and an easy control of the process of argumentation, which makes it a pleasure to read them, and which elicits confidence both in the candor and the judgment of the authors.

IV. ETHICS.

*Dorner's Christian Doctrine of Morals.*¹

This work should have been noticed in CURRENT DISCUSSIONS of last year, but the volume was delayed on its way, and failed to reach us till it was too late for even a cursory review. We now give it but brief space, because the principles on which it is based were noticed in a review of the author's *System of Christian Doctrine*, in CURRENT DISCUSSIONS for 1883. The work before us was published after the death of the author, under the supervision of his son, Prof. A. Dorner of Wittenberg. It takes the German view of ethics and embraces the practical results of the Christian system in human experience as a necessary part of a complete moral system. Dorner does not, like Frank, set aside natural morals as incapable of forming a system, but makes Christian morals embrace and complete philosophical morals, so that one consistent system is formed by appropriating and Christianizing that which by itself is simply natural. He says : "The Christian doctrine of morals is the science of that which has absolute worth, which, for form, is realized through the self-determination of the personality, but, for content, is to be described as the appropriation of the natural personality and with it of the first creation by the Holy Spirit."² The worth here spoken of, he explains, is not utility which is a finite good and not of absolute worth. It is not to be supposed, however, that the natural man lives in the truly moral, or perhaps more properly ethical, realm ; his realm is rather

¹ *System der christlichen Sittenlehre*, von Dr. I. A. Dorner, Berlin, 1885.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

one that may be made ethical. The fundamental moral exercise of the soul is religious,—love of God.¹ This never is, never can be, attained by man in the state of nature. Man is under law; the law commands what is right, commands love, but love as obedience to law is not the love of God as the chief good. There are three things to be regarded in an ethical system; law, good, and virtue. Neither of these can be omitted from consideration; each must have its due place. But the highest good is God; He is the primal good (*der Urgute*), and love of Him is the condition of any right movement of any character worthy of approval. Therefore only the renewed man, the one awakened to love, can enter on the truly ethical life. Dorner looks upon men as sinners, sinners by birth, in the mass, because of the solidarity of the race, and considers that they would be disloyal to their parents and to God if they claimed to be other than sinners, foolish if they expected to be other. Yet they have conscience, which is the voice of God and coincides with the law of God wherever that is proclaimed, and coincides with the requirements of the Gospel when that is proclaimed, which is therefore a bridge from the state of nature to the state of reconciliation with God. When the law is proclaimed, those who are addressed by it have a new consciousness, that of freedom and the duty of breaking away from nature, so that they are advanced toward a moral standing and the law proves a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ. But, though the Rabbins called the law-state of man a new creation, there is not attained under the law the Christian consciousness, consequently there is not as yet

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

any divine communion or any holy love. In the fullness of time the incarnate Son of God appears. He is of the human race, he takes his place so near to God that he covers the race to the eye of the Father, the Father sees the race in the Son and is reconciled with it. Christ is not an atom, he is humanity itself, and in him the race exercises love and is possessed of true worth.

It will naturally be asked whether Christ so stands for the human race that his character is the character of each individual man, or, again, whether through his all-embracing might the individual is lost in the mass. In reply, it is to be said that neither of these is to be held. The individual retains his character till it is changed by an act of his own will. And Dorner teaches that it is not a feeble but vigorous will-act that brings one into communion with God.¹ Both in the state of sin and of redemption individuality is consistent with the solidarity of the race. Each individual, however, has the privilege of partaking of Christ's character, and of entering through him into communion with God. The absolutely perfect life of love presents itself in the God-man, and from him spreads out, through ethical means, into humanity. We are by nature capable of union with the divine, and the capacity is realized when we have faith in our head, Jesus Christ. He by his loving devotion to humanity effects in men a reliance upon him by faith, and thus there rises the organized community, actuated by love. This community embraces all those who accept Christ as their head, and constitutes the kingdom of God. Christ is in himself the law of duty, the law of love, and the virtue of the human

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 337.

race ; consequently all who are in him have entered on the true ethical life whether judged by the standard of duty, love, or virtue. And there is practically no other access to a virtuous life, the Christian through all his career advances only as he makes Christ his pattern. These views present clearly the relation of Christianity to philosophical morals. The morals prescribed by the law of duty depend on an ought, an abstraction, and have no substantial being ; but Christianity, through the power of love, transforms that which ought to be into a reality. To put the same idea in another form : men in a state of nature, regarding or disregarding, but, in either case, never fulfilling the ought, are made new creatures in Christ Jesus, and then make real the ideal ethical life ; Christianity mediates between the first and second creation. Christianity completes the theory of philosophical morals, and makes the perfected system a reality in practice through the life of love.

*The Service of Man.*¹

The Athenæum says : “ This book is the most powerful attack on Christianity that has been produced in England during this generation.” Its aim is to show that Christianity fails to meet the wants of men. It is to run its course as other religions have run theirs, and is to vanish away as they have vanished. Religions have appeared one after another in the evolutionary progress of things, have fulfilled their mission and have died. Christianity, the last and best, is to be spoken of with respect, but has

¹ *The Service of Man.* An Essay towards the Religion of the Future. By James Cotter Morison. London, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887.

accomplished its work, and will cease to exist as soon as sensitive and timid people have adjusted their feelings to the fact that it can no longer be useful. "There seems to be no exception to the rule that the older religions grow, the more infirm do they become, the less hold do they keep on the minds of well informed and thoughtful men. Their truths, once accepted without question, are gradually doubted, and in the end denied by increasing numbers. This fate happened to Greek and Roman polytheism, and according to all appearances it is now happening to Hindooism, Islam, and to both Protestant and Catholic theology."¹ The power that is supposed to be displacing religion is morality, which is constantly making demands that religion cannot supply. "And now Christian monotheism is sharing the fate of its predecessors; it is being superseded by the growing conscience of mankind."²

Our author's starting-point in his speculations is this: he holds that a future life is one of the most enormous assumptions, without proof, ever made; he holds that the idea that men can do without God is rapidly spreading over all the earth; and that the present aim of men is to promote human well-being on the earth. "Let us honestly take our side, and admit that the *Civitas Dei* is a dream of the past, and that we should strive to realize that *Regnum Hominis* which Bacon foresaw and predicted."³

Applying to Christianity the test derived from these fundamental principles, the author attempts to show that it has been a failure. Its theology is unsupported; its doctrine of the origin of man has been shown to be false, its doctrine of the fall is "a mere fiction of a primitive

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 41.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

cosmogony, its doctrine of miracles is easily explained by the tendency of uncultivated people to believe in wonders, the rise and progress of Christianity are not to be attributed to supernatural power." "Strauss, Baur, Keim, and Hausrath have made the early history of Christianity at least as intelligible as other scholars have made the early history of Rome."¹ But these things are of small account; "The deepest change which this age has seen in reference to men's attitude towards the current theology has taken place, not in the region of the understanding, but in that of the heart. It is not so much that the Bible, with its miracles and legends, is felt to be untrue and incredible by the trained reason; a great number of theological dogmas are felt to be morally repulsive and horrible by the mere human conscience of modern times."² Here, of course, the doctrines of eternal punishment and expiatory atonement come in for a share of the condemnation.

Besides this decay of belief, Christianity fails to afford, so the author thinks, the consolations which it promises. Its chief solace is hope for the future life, yet it portrays in terrific language the sufferings which await the majority of mankind in the world to come, while in this world it is a source of discipline and torture rather than of pleasure. Some modern reliefs, he admits, have been introduced into Christian doctrine, but this he puts to the credit of science, while he maintains that religion, when it bore full sway, delighted in the distresses of its adherents. "The hideous boxes called pews, the dolorous and droning music" were bad enough, but "the gloomy horrors of

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

² *Ibid.*, p. 33.

the creed" were indescribable. "The younger generation has hardly an idea of the dismal spiritual pit in which their fathers lived. In the eighteenth century the case was still worse. The chill shade of religious dread spread beyond the circle of the professedly devout, and darkened life and literature. Only profane revellers passed out of it, and their example was not edifying."¹

The author thinks morals are in the inverse ratio to the influence of Christianity. He instances bishops, priests, and high Church officials, who were monsters of iniquity in times when the Church was all-powerful, and considers that his case is made out. "Taking them broadly, the Ages of Faith were emphatically ages of crime, of gross and scandalous wickedness, of cruelty, and, in a word, of immorality. And it is noteworthy that in proportion as we recede backward from the present age, and return into the Ages of Faith, we find that the crime and the sin become denser and blacker."² "This, beyond any question, is the most moral age which the world has seen; and it is as certainly the least believing age since Christianity became the religion of the West."³ He thinks one cause of the immorality flowing out of Christianity is due to the doctrine of justification by faith alone, especially when connected with the doctrine that true faith exercised at the moment of death, after however long a career in crime, secures eternal happiness in heaven. For this reason Christ's promise to the thief on the cross was an encouragement to sin, and the preaching of a free salvation to all is a license to continue in crime. "It is not going too far to say that the doctrine of all Christians in

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

² *Ibid.*, p. 118.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

the final result is antinomian and positively immoral. They do not only not support and strengthen morality as they claim to do, they deliberately reject and scorn it. They place on a level the most virtuous and the most flagitious conduct carried on throughout a long lifetime; and this certainly must be held to be putting as great an affront on morality as it is possible to inflict." ¹

Morison finds something, however, to admire in Christianity: "Its influence on the spiritual side of characters, naturally susceptible to its action, has been transcendent, overpowering, and unparalleled." ² He lingers with delight over the exhibitions of self-denial, benevolence, and asceticism which are to be found in Church history. He exhibits the most genuine admiration for such persons as Sir Thomas More, Pascal and his sister, and others who have renounced the world or devoted themselves to the good of humanity. But he considers Christianity powerless for good over the mass of men through this its noblest trait. It is an influence quite too elevated, too ethereal to reach the mass of men. "It is this transcendental character of Christian perfection which has ever made it at once such an imperfect fosterer of morality and such a stimulator of spirituality and heroic passion. . . . How utterly unequal average human nature is to this transcendent pitch of self-sacrifice, the past and present record of Christianity sufficiently proves." ³

For these reasons the author considers Christianity a failure. Its spiritual elements do not address themselves effectively to mankind. It cannot so present hopes and fears for the future as to restrain men from present self-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

² *Ibid.*, p. 192.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 205.

indulgence ; it cannot so rouse the heroic spirit in man as to make him, in ordinary cases, a devotee to the good of others. A morality below this ideal and romantic self-devotion it despises and does not attempt to cultivate. Consequently, intelligent and thoughtful men reject the scheme as inadequate to the wants of the world. Its foundation is defective, its superstructure a falsehood ; it has acquired a hold upon the feelings of men through deception, and the influence it has exercised has been mischievous. True, religions appear of necessity in the evolution of humanity, Christianity having a place among them, but their day is past ; if they ever were of value, they are now simply forces that debase the intellect and corrupt the heart.

The religion of the future, of which mention is made on the title-page, is but very briefly presented, the author having been prevented from completing his work by failing health. But his views are presented sufficiently to give us a general idea of what he supposes to be the goal and blessedness of humanity. He would have no more idolatry, no more theolatriy, but henceforth anthropolatry. Men have served God too long, they should now serve their fellow-men. "What is wanted is the conscious cultivation, enlightened by science, of society as a whole." "The point to be noticed is that the social revolution will be accomplished on secular principles ; that this province of practical life is once for all severed from any theological interference." "What humanity needs is not people who lead unsocial and wicked lives, and are very sorry when about to die, but people who, at an early period, begin to render valuable service to the good cause, and continue rendering more valuable service as they advance

in years. We cannot take regrets and repentance in lieu of work ; performance only avails.”¹

To secure these ends we must have good men. The basis of morality is inborn. We have, to some extent, men of the right kind ; now we must set ourselves to the work of securing a more abundant supply, as wisely as we would to develop muscle or improve the breed of cattle. “ Nothing is gained by disguising the fact that there is no remedy for a bad heart, and no substitute for a good one. Only on good, unselfish instincts can a trustworthy morality repose.”² The author quotes Herbert Spencer, to show that only the feeling, sympathetic, generous heart is the source of the morality on which general well-being depends. Perfect morality must be based on perfect altruism.

This work does not seem to us a formidable attack upon Christianity, but is worthy of notice as indicating the tendency of thought among certain able and earnest-minded men. The author is very familiar with the Bible, with the doctrines of religion, and with the historical developments of practical Christianity ; he is therefore worthy of a hearing, yet he seems to us not to see in what the real essence of Christianity lies.

1. He is perfectly regardless, apparently unconscious, of the power of Christian faith. The new life, the value of peace with God, of a quiet conscience, of the pardon of sin, hope that looks beyond the present life, the sense of relationship with the divine, are considerations of which he has not the slightest apprehension ; if such things are facts in the Christian’s experience, then there is a world to which the author has no access.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 262, 3, 8.

² *Ibid.*, p. 295.

2. His jeers at the doctrine of justification, especially at the idea of deliverance from condemnation because of repentance at the close of life, are uttered without any regard to the penitence which is the condition of deliverance, without any regard to the self-condemnation and self-renunciation which accompany penitence.

3. He gives no consideration to the Christian estimate of the future life, but judges of merit simply by an earthly standard of destiny as wholly connected with the present world. He ought at least to allow that eternal continuance of conscious existence may properly influence those who believe in it.

4. He wholly ignores the consolations, the joys, of faith and prayer, enjoyed by millions of humble Christians because of their acceptance of the New Testament, and assumes to have proved the worthlessness of our religion by pointing out the flagitious lives of a few ambitious and sensual church officials.

5. It is more difficult to make his altruism practical and efficient than it is to make devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ practical and efficient. Average human nature is as truly unequal to a consecration to this impalpable sentiment as to the transcendent pitch of self-sacrifice which he finds demanded by Christianity.

6. The service of God aiming to secure through a realization of the divine purposes the eternal blessedness of men, each one's self included, is an infinitely higher object of pursuit than the service of humanity aiming to secure brief earthly happiness for as many as possible, the worker's self excluded. The unity, the glory, the divine affinities, of the kingdom of God make an atomistic, transient kingdom of man seem contemptible.

Thus a mere comparison of the elements of the system which our author opposes with the elements of that which he approves seems to us to render his scheme utterly powerless in its appeal to the common sentiments and the common sense of men. We believe the things which he denies to Christianity can be securely established, but argument in proof of immortality, miracles, and revelation is not necessary in reply to such a work as this.

In conclusion, it is worth while to notice, as a curiosity, the wide divergence of modern speculators in their views of morals and religion. Professor Bowne finds God the condition of all science, all thought, all being. Mr. Morison finds ideas of God clinging to undeveloped man, but, as humanity moves on into the enjoyment of its mature powers, he finds that these ideas are sloughed off, and the human race shows itself rounded and complete in itself. All Christian moralists consider freedom the foundation of ethical character, and the rousing of the will to resolute action the proper means of moral improvement; our author considers determinism the true philosophy, and the accumulation of motives about a passive will the proper method of culture. "It is obvious that the free-will doctrine turns the attention away from the essential and real side of moral cultivation, and directs it to an unreal side."¹ It is generally held by philosophers and moralists that the sense of responsibility is the most real, most powerful, of all our moral feelings, and the only basis of moral character; but our author thinks: "The sooner the idea of moral responsibility is got rid of, the better it will be for society and moral education."² "No merit or demerit

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 287.

² *Ibid.*, p. 293.

attaches to the saint or the sinner in the metaphysical and mystic sense of the word. A man inherits his brain as much as he inherits his estate."¹ Some Christian moralists hold that the civic and domestic virtues are vices unless they are generated from the love of God, and all Christian moralists consider them to be without real holiness except as they are subordinated to such love; our author, on the other hand, teaches that they are virtues only as regard for God is eradicated from them and regard for man is supreme.

V. ESCHATOLOGY.

*Kliefoth's Eschatology.*²

Kliefoth's *Eschatology* is a thorough treatise upon a topic now exciting much interest. He discusses all the questions connected with his subject,—death, the intermediate state, probation, the signs of the end, the end itself, the resurrection, the judgment, the punishment of the wicked, the new humanity, and the new earth. The author was born in 1810, has long been one of the foremost divines of Western Germany, and brings to the work before us great familiarity with the theme, having published years ago commentaries on Daniel and the Apocalypse. We shall simply present his views upon a few points of special interest at the present time.

He teaches that there will finally exist a holy humanity, as perfect as if there had been no sin, but that the eradication of sin will be the result of divine interposition; that

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 292.

² *Christliche Eschatologie*, von Dr. Th. Kliefoth, Leipzig, 1886.

to suppose it to be the result of development would be a *contradictio in adjecto*. Sin must remain as long as the *development continues*.¹

He opposes the Pelagian idea, advocated also by others, that man is mortal by his original nature, but holds that death is an order of nature coming in since creation, because of transgression. He teaches also that the three forms of death constitute one death ; that they are connected as a unit and succeed each other in a natural order ; that the second or eternal death is the true and proper death ; that spiritual and bodily death are at once punishments of sin and means of grace.²

The author rejects all connection between the eschatology of the Bible and that of heathen mythologies. Ideas concerning resurrection and purgatory are indeed found among pagan nations, but their similarity to Christian ideas is apparent rather than real. He does not hold to the doctrine of purgatory, but, as a Christian doctrine, traces it to a certain estimate of Christian character, while these mythologic doctrines rest on wholly pantheistic grounds. He thinks, if those who attempt to illustrate Christianity from mythology had understood mythology better, they would have saved themselves trouble, and not have exposed Christianity to the attacks of unbelief.³

He rejects from this field of investigation Schleiermacher's test of Christian doctrine, viz.: Christian consciousness. He says, If this were a correct principle, we should have nothing to say about eschatology. This has to do with facts, things which God is to perform hereafter, "such as our awakening, the parousia, the judgment of the world,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

² *Ibid.*, p. 47.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

the destruction of this and the establishment of a new world." ¹

The author's view of the succession of events at the close of the dispensation is given in the following, "In the center of the last things, as the middle-point of the works of God which effect the consummation, the prophecy of the holy Scripture sets the parousia, the visible return of the Lord and Saviour, which has the judgment of the world, the resurrection with the change [of the living], the final judgment, and the end of the world for its immediate accompaniment, and with these establishes the end properly so called, the separation between time and eternity, between historical development and completion." ²

He gives his view of the intermediate state with great positiveness, as if the Bible permitted but one view as possible. He rejects the state of sleep as unscriptural, also the state of passivity and potentiality, — half-sleep; and says, "Because of the method in which God has, in his plan of redemption, introduced death between the life of earth and the consummation, it is not the entrance either into the consummation or into a new life, and the state following upon it is neither the consummation nor a life carrying out the earth-life and its development unfolding itself in time and space, advance and opposition, but the dead are, while the development of the plan of redemption proceeds on its course in the succession of time here on earth, by bodily death taken out of this world and its current of time, to be reserved with a preservation of their personality in a conscious and wakeful state, but without time, without body, without work, unto the con-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

Ibid., p. 26.

summation through the parousia.”¹ Again, he says, “Life in its proper sense precedes the death of the body and follows the resurrection, but the intermediate state, called the death-state as beginning with death, neither includes annihilation or suspension of existence, nor excludes a being with God and Christ for the pious, or a state of misery for the ungodly.”²

The doctrine of purgatory, which he traces to Augustine, he says the Protestant churches are obliged decisively to reject, since they attribute salvation to faith alone, and hold that it derogates from the merits of Christ to attribute it in any way to human works or human purifications.

He opposes very firmly the position that the parousia, not death ends probation. This he argues specially with reference to those who receive the Gospel call in this life, his view concerning others will be noticed hereafter. He gives Oertel's argument in favor of continued probation as being essentially that relied upon by its advocates, but considers it wholly inadequate to the conclusion. To this argument he opposes the view, which he considers to be already established, that the intermediate state is not one of changes. He says also that if preaching began in Hades and is carried on in that world and on earth alike, there must be churches, edification through the word of God and the sacraments, growing in grace and backslidings, in that world as well as in this. Such doctrines, he holds, have quite too little support in the Scriptures to permit a rational acceptance. It is to be noticed that he brings forward only the Scriptural argument in favor of future probation, does not even notice the philosophical argu-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

² *Ibid.*, p. 50.

ment, which is the only one relied upon in this country. The only texts on which Oertel builds his doctrine are I. Peter iii. 18, 19; iv. 6; Rev. v. 13; Phil. ii. 10; for he admits that the paying of the uttermost farthing, and the not forgiving the sin against the Holy Ghost in the world to come, are not to be used in this connection. Kliefoth's Scriptural argument against continued probation is that with which we have become familiar in this country. He quotes as applicable II. Cor. v. 10, with the remark, here "the apostle simply and plainly makes the issue of the final judgment depend on our conduct on earth, and many other Scripture texts do the same."

The author's explanation of I Pet. iii. 19 is of interest, though not wholly new. He thinks that Christ's Spirit wakened out of its state of death for reunion with the body, but before reunion made proclamation of the now accomplished redemption. Because of this proclamation the dead in Hades could be subjected to a Christian judgment; the righteous could enter into heaven, the wicked be consigned to their realms of punishment. Up to this time, all, good and bad, were gathered in Hades; those saved by hope were not yet new creatures, those who had continued in sin could not yet be condemned. But after this proclamation of Christ each could be sent to his own place. For the same purpose the Gospel was preached to those who had never known of the promise of the coming deliverer, as the author thinks, at the same time, and by Christ. "The Lord went to Sheol to make proclamation, and preach the Gospel, in order to afford to the dead the possibility, through the revelation of the perfected redemption, to pass from death to life, from Sheol into blessedness. To set the world before Christ in the

position of the world after Christ, is the significance of Christ's descent to Hades."¹

The author holds that the destiny of those who never heard the Gospel is fixed in a way analogous to that by which the doom of the pre-Christian ages was determined. He believes in a general call to all men through the conscience and the natural knowledge of God, yet believes that the final judgment will be in accordance with the Gospel. He thinks the two positions may be made consistent with each other by the supposition that Christ is revealed at the judgment to be accepted or rejected according to one's previous life. "So will all who remained uncalled in this life, if the salvation in Christ is made known to them in that life, accept it unto life if they in this life, through regard to the general call, had been acceptable to God; but will reject it unto judgment if they in this life had disregarded and despised the general call; accordingly, even for them will this life be the seed-time, and that life the harvest, and their future destiny be fixed on the ground of that which they became and were, so that the rule, II. Cor. v. 10, remains in force for them as well as for those called here, as also it is exactly expressed in Rom. ii. 16, if that verse is taken in connection with the one preceding it."²

The author's chief difficulty seems to be with unbaptized infants. His language is, "We have simply to say that they are to be numbered among those remaining uncalled, because the means of calling to salvation appointed for children, baptism, has not been imparted to them, but that to them also, as to all uncalled in this life,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

² *Ibid.*, p. 111.

salvation in Christ will be made known in his time, as to which we may cherish the hope that it will turn out to their salvation and life, because their life in this world, though involved in original sin, yet had not been developed to a breach with grace.”¹

There are many topics of interest in this work, as the Resurrection, the character of Antichrist, etc., but we have not space for them.

*Future Retribution.*²

Prebendary Row is one of those men who think that Christianity is the more readily comprehended and embraced the more nearly it is identified with nature. His Bampton Lectures on apologetics were written with the idea that the less there is of Christianity, the more easily it can be defended. There is no doubt that he has made an exceedingly good argument for that which he accepts as Christianity, but the value of a collection of religious truths without inspiration, without susceptibility of theological statement, and without any efficient vitalizing force, is subject to question. The power of Christianity is in the fact that it is a self-sustaining system, that it stands over against the world as a scheme complete in itself. Its real value is in the fact that it makes men new creatures, and introduces them into a new and higher life, which vindicates itself as divine,—at least to all those who experience it. Mr. Row, on the other hand, does not believe in the fall of man; does not believe in a real

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

² *Future Retribution Viewed in the Light of Reason and Revelation.* By C. A. Row, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral. New York, Thomas Whittaker, 1887.

depravity of nature ; does not, therefore, believe in the new birth, and of course rejects anything like a *scheme* of grace. Systems of theology, schemes of doctrine setting forth the sinfulness of man as total and universal, grace as prevenient, purposed, electing, and irresistible, are to him appalling ; he fairly shudders as he contemplates the contrariety of theology to religion. He looks upon men, however, as beset by temptations, often possessed of evil tendencies from birth, and always in need of instruction because of their ignorance and inexperience ; and he earnestly asks, What course will they take, and what will be their doom ? While he does not believe in conversion, he acknowledges that there is danger that men will be led away by temptations, that they will become hardened in sin and forfeit the favor of God. Though the influences that draw men towards a holy life are many and strong, he sees reason to suppose that they will not prevail in every case, and therefore raises the question, What is to be the fate of incorrigible transgressors ?

The volume before us is written as a reply to this question. The author holds to a life after death for all, holds to the doctrine of rewards and punishments, rejects universalism and conditional immortality as unscriptural, and seems to adopt, as most probable, the view that the wicked, after a fit punishment, are annihilated ; annihilated either by direct act of God, or by passing into non-existence through the natural effect of punishment. He rejects, therefore, the doctrine of endless punishment, but holds to a punishment proportioned to guilt. His argument against eternal punishment — “endless existence in never-ending torment” — is the usual one with which most students of theology are familiar. He does not consider that the sin

of a human being can deserve endless punishment. He does not find in the Scriptures the slightest hint that such punishment is threatened. He interprets the nouns translated destruction as denoting an end of existence, not its continuance. He translates *αιώνιος* age-long; when the term is applied to God, he understands it to mean, "who endures through the ages."

The chapter of most interest at the present time is that on future probation. The author adopts this doctrine with full confidence, and should have the credit, so far as we know, of introducing a new proof text in its favor, viz.: I. Cor. xi. 30-32. Some of those who received the Lord's Supper unworthily, slept, — were dead. But this was a chastisement, intended for the restoration of those who had died. But it is not clear that the sleep was a chastisement, and, if it were, it was applied to believers as discipline, and not to the impenitent as a probation, so that the discovery is not very important. His main argument in favor of the doctrine is from God's benevolence, justice, and love. He designates five classes of persons to whom he thinks a future probation will be granted: 1, those who have never heard of Christ; 2, those in Christian lands who have been brought up in an atmosphere of irreligion and vice; 3, those who have known only imperfect versions of Christianity, the truth having been hidden under theology; 4, those born with strong tendencies to evil, and living amid moral and social corruptions; 5, those whose probation has been cut short by early death.¹

The query which first suggests itself on reading this chapter is, whether it is not better to consider the life to come as the real probation, and this life as a kind of prep-

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 363-375.

aration for it. The heathen, those dying in youth, those unfortunately constituted, and those unfortunately circumstanced, all have their probation in the next world; there can hardly be left one in a thousand who has a fair probation in this life. On second thought the query rises, whether one or two classes might not properly be added to those who are to be granted a probation after death. There is no reason to doubt that the theologians who have taught a false Christianity were sincere and honest men; if, then, they were wrong, were they not misled by commentators and the master thinkers whom they followed, and should they not be allowed a probation where they can be exempt from the trammels of Augustine, Calvin, and Arminius? And, again, the Bible being an obscure book, and variously interpreted, should not those who have mistaken its meaning, especially those who have little leisure for study, and do not understand the original languages of the Scriptures, be allowed a better chance in another world? Or, to sum up the matter briefly, can we not say, God, rather than man, needs another probation? May we not say, He has brought affairs to an unhappy issue in this world of sin and should have another opportunity, in the coming time, to improve upon the experiment?

Mr. Row has abundance of that logical ability which he so much despises. If he would make more use of it, we believe he would write fewer and better books.

*Probation.*¹

This work consists of a series of papers originally published in *The Homiletic Magazine*. The essays are by able

¹ *Future Probation: A Symposium on the Question, Is Salvation possible after Death?* New York, T. Whittaker, 1886.

men, Principal Cairns and Rev. Edward White being among them. While we find here nothing which needs to be reproduced in CURRENT DISCUSSIONS in addition to what has already been said, we can most cordially commend the work to our readers. The essays represent almost all possible phases of sentiment on this topic, they are all clear and candid, and together present almost all that can be said concerning future probation, apart from the Dorner view of it. It is a curious fact that not one of these papers touches the doctrine of future probation as it is taught in this country. The doctrine as an inference from certain philosophical views of theology is not noticed. The discussion is confined here to the Scriptural argument and to the *a priori* argument drawn from the justice and benevolence of God, from his purpose in the creation of man, and from his power to carry out his purpose. Whoever reads this book will be surprised to notice how perfectly all parties, Jews, Swedenborgians, Restorationists, etc., agree as to the material that enters into the argument, and to notice how small is the amount of that material. And whoever will read the entire book at once—in one day—will be very thoroughly convinced, as it seems to us, that the doctrine of future probation has no such basis in the Scriptures and the character of God as to entitle it to any influence upon our theological beliefs.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

RECENT STUDIES IN
PASTORAL THEOLOGY,

BY

REV. G. B. WILLCOX,

PROFESSOR OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY AND SPECIAL STUDIES,
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

THE discussions in this department are of so miscellaneous a character, and so many of them found in our periodical religious literature, as to prevent as methodical a treatment of them as is desirable.

CHAPTER I.

THE PASTOR PERSONALLY.

MINISTER'S VACATIONS.

ON this matter, so much debated, Dr. M. R. Vincent has some just remarks in *The Homiletic Review* for June, 1887. Speaking more especially for city pastors, in reply to the complaint that they take more rest than men of other professions, he urges (1) that the strain on the minister is incessant, increased by constant interruptions, annoying and wearying him from morning to night; (2) that he carries a load of responsibility, in connection with boards of trust and all manner of Christian enterprises, which no one man should be made to bear; (3) that the drain on his vital force from sympathy with the suffering is immense;—while a physician, it is true, encounters much suffering, his duty requires him to deal with it only pro-

fessionally and coolly, while for a pastor that would be inadmissible; (4) the minister must assume a large amount of drudgery, of various sorts, which a merchant or lawyer throws off on assistants. Again, while laymen have fifty-two Sabbaths in the year for rest, these are the pastor's days of hardest toil; and the pleasant fiction of Monday as a rest-day is dispelled by the numerous meetings of committees, appointed on that day because ministers are supposed to be at leisure.

The complaint that, by pastors' leaving home simultaneously, their people are deprived of service at funerals, Dr. Vincent concedes to be just. For that some provision should be made. The obvious provision would seem to be that vacations should not synchronize. Or, if that be unavoidable, the official boards of the denominational societies should provide clergymen for such occasions. The complaint, sometimes heard, that pastors tire themselves by supplying other pulpits in vacations, is answered by the facts, first, that most of them would, otherwise, be unable to meet the expense of taking a vacation; and, second, that, for many, not all perhaps, the labor of preaching, when the brain-work of preparation has been already accomplished, is inconsiderable.

MINISTERS AS PRACTICAL BUSINESS MEN.

Rev. Dr. D. C. Eddy, in *The Homiletic Review* for January, 1887, appears as champion for the business reputation of clergymen. He complains of the aspersion that they know nothing of financial affairs. He shows how many of them, in responsible positions in the financial management of great missionary, charitable, and publish-

ing societies, have amply vindicated their right to full confidence.

Beyond reasonable question the common detraction as to this matter rests mainly on theory as to what might naturally be expected of men given to spiritual concerns. It is a theory with sparse facts to uphold it. But a few years since, two of our largest publishing societies, in two different cities, after being almost wrecked by laymen, were rescued by clergymen who stepped into their places. We remember a heavy debt on a large church, of the speedy payment of which the trustees despaired, but which was swept away by the pastor's irrepressible courage and energy. Clergymen are not wanting in aptness for practical affairs.

But every pastor has need of caution in the management of his own finances. There occurs to us one who, without dishonest intent, allowed himself, through neglect and unthrift, to be pursued from town to town by a shadowed reputation ; another who, from the same cause, passed the last years of his life in such mental suffering as ended in partial derangement ; and a third, who, while his praise was in all the churches, was saved from ruinous and needless financial disaster only by the assistance of friends. The simple remedy for all this is positively to know, at the commencement of each month, if not oftener, the exact condition of one's affairs, and to act accordingly.

THE ENGLISH COUNTRY PARSON AS HE WAS AND IS.

Blackwood's Magazine for September, 1887. — Here is a theme to which admirably apply the words of the preacher, " Say not thou, What is the cause that the former days

were better than these? for thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this." As late as sixty years ago, a rector in the Church of England was, according to this writer, a subordinated part of a system, a retainer of the peer or heavy country gentleman, to whom belonged the presentation of the living. Heroic courage for the truth or self-sacrifice for the welfare of men rarely entered into his plans. He was a highly respectable gentleman. He held up the tone of good society. His sermons, while "they taught the reality of Christianity, and insisted on his hearers' believing it, as they believed the history of England," rarely laid hold, with any startling energy, on the heart. His preaching, like his life, held languidly at a level rather below than above any serious deflection from right. He looked on Dissenters with the patronizing good-nature of one in a superior position to which none of them would make bold to aspire.

But the progress of the voluntary principle in church polity, continually strengthening Dissent, the liberal legislation of more recent years, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill, have almost revolutionized the status of the Church clergy. The Dissenter has risen above the reach of condescension. The former tacit recognition of the national position and social superiority of the Church has passed completely by. The rector is made to see, with most uncomfortable distinctness, that his standing and influence depend on his personal efficiency. He is therefore perpetually "on the go." He inaugurates penny-readings, harvest-home festivals with a church-service, lectures and entertainments without number. He identifies himself with the amusements of the people, as well as with

their more serious concerns. He aims to show them that the Church is everywhere, and has numberless points of contact and of sympathy with themselves.

How far this competition with the Dissenter will conduce to the spirituality of the incumbent may be a question. But it is at least clear that the voluntary sentiment, making the pastor answerable to the public opinion of the community, is rapidly penetrating parishes where the living is still in the hands of a patron.

THE SUPPORT OF THE ENGLISH CLERGY.

Our American pastors are in no danger of demoralization from faring sumptuously every day. They have ample opportunity for growth in the grace of self-denial. But it may console them to know that the "same afflictions," possibly greater, "are accomplished in their brethren that are in the world." In *The Nineteenth Century* for March, 1887, the veil is lifted from the domestic life of the average English rector, disclosing such privations as may help us to contentment with our lot.

It would of course be as embarrassing and impracticable for the rector to collect his own tithes as for an American pastor to apply in person for pew-rents. By collector's fees, by losses through the inability of the poorer parishioners and otherwise, his stipend is commonly reduced about seven per cent. But his income-tax is assessed on the entire nominal amount. Also, he is obliged to keep the rectory in perfect repair, at his own cost. Again, though, as occasionally happens, with two parishes on his hands, he is obliged to employ a curate, no allowance is made in his assessment for this subtraction from the stipend.

Further, though any one in the parish may bury in the church-yard, the surface of it belongs to the incumbent. He might legally therefore, in his straits, pasture cattle within the inclosure. But a law of propriety, as strong as any on the statute-books, forbids. Yet he is obliged to keep in order, from his own purse, this consecrated surface, from which he is allowed to draw no profit. And, to crown all, his income land-tax is increased by this precious real-estate which is worth to him considerably less than nothing. Again, there is, not infrequently, incredible as it seems, interest charged against him on a mortgage left on the glebe by his predecessor. In many a parish these taxes are met only by dispensing with butter from the family table. And, as it is understood that the rector cannot possibly live on his stipend with all its subtractions, a new incumbent is often anxiously asked if he has private means with which to keep up the style of living of his predecessor. It is a question in which servants, laundresses, market-men, grocers, and others have a keen personal interest. There is, in all this, suggestive matter for reflection on the assumed reliableness of a State church for ministerial support, and the precariousness of the voluntary system.

CHAPTER II.

PARISH WORK.

YOUNG PEOPLE'S SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR.

THE progress of our churches in their policy with the young has been by slow successive stages. Among the fathers of New England, instruction was given by the pastor, with the Catechism, in his own home or in the homes of the children. Early in the present century came in the Sunday-school, but by no means without objection and opposition. It would astonish the young people of the present generation to know how an institution which now seems as much a matter of course as the common school was met. Wise and devout men, pastors and patriarchs in churches, frowned on the innovation. It was an untried novelty. No one could predict what mischief might grow out of it. The pastor was the only authorized and competent teacher of the young. To commit them to young men, and especially young women, in a Sunday-school, was a dangerous experiment. Frivolity and false doctrine, and all manner of vagaries, would come in like a flood.

But, when the school had finally won for itself a place, only a first step was taken, which waited long for a second. The youth and children were gathered for instruction merely. They were to be simply recipients. That they were, at so tender age, to be trained for efficient service, that they might become sources of spiritual power, and

contribute to the general work of the Church, was a notion that was not for a half-century to loom up to view. The chief reliance of the kingdom of Christ was supposed to be the intellect of its foremost men. It was not yet perceived that intellect must be mainly concerned with explaining and defending the truth. It was yet to be discovered that moral qualities, empowered by God's indwelling, must lead the way in aggressive work for any spiritual interest. That goodness is as much greater than greatness as it is more beautiful was a truth which it was left to a later generation to observe and apply. Comparatively little dependence, of course, was placed on the service in the churches of women or of youth. But more recently Christians are reverting to the profounder wisdom of the Master. They are valuing more highly the moral and affectional qualities through which it is His delight to work. And, naturally, the truth is emerging to recognition that youth and children are to be not only fed with instruction, but trained to activity in the Christian life. The Young Men's Christian Association was one step in this direction. The more recent Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, including, as it does, a membership of still more tender years, is another.

The latter society owes its origin to Rev. F. E. Clark, recently elected president of the national organization. In the winter of 1880-81, while a pastor in Portland, Maine, he was successful in leading to Christ a large number of boys and girls, averaging something over fourteen years of age. Recognizing that the best safe-guard against a relapse would be some organized method of Christian work, he proposed a plan for that purpose. The constitution of the new society which he proceeded to found

contained some peculiar features. There are Active Members, who, though not necessarily church-members, are presumably Christian disciples. There are Associate Members, who enjoy most of the privileges, though none of the control, of the Society. The expectation and endeavor are to lead them to a personal interest in Christ. There are seven committees, with provision for more if necessary, viz.: the Prayer-meeting, Lookout, Social, Missionary, Sunday-school, Relief, and Flower Committees. Some of the rules, especially with reference to the Prayer-meeting, are peculiar and strict. Every Active Member is expected to be present, unless detained by absolute necessity, at every such meeting, and to take some part, however slight, in the service. Unexplained absence from three consecutive meetings annuls one's membership in the Society. Rigid rules are designed as a training or drill in a wholesome sense of personal responsibility.

The chief objects of the organization, as given by its founder, are five: (1) a fit method by which, once a week at least, youth and children may publicly acknowledge Christ; (2) some way for the young, of practical Christian activity; (3) to enable the pastor and other Christian friends to learn the religious condition of the young people; (4) to form a stepping-stone to church membership, a temporary shelter from worldly distractions and temptations in the weakness and ignorance of early discipleship; and (5) to prepare the members for future efficiency in the church.

The Lookout Committee keeps on the alert to draw into the Society every young person in the congregation. The Social Committee provides reading, music, games, etc., for

a monthly social gathering. The Prayer-meeting Committee selects subjects for those meetings, and sees to the observance of the rule that no one shall be exempt from some audible share in each service.

Young people's religious associations are no novelty. But, none the less, this Christian Endeavor Society is one of the most signal phenomena in the church life of this century. It more thoroughly organizes what had been before but half developed. It trains our youth, and even children, to a more robust sense of personal obligation. It cherishes a fraternal spirit among various Christian communions. Having originated in a Congregational church, it numbered in June, 1887, 2,314 organizations. These include 100,000 "active" and 40,000 "associate" members. They are distributed through every State and Territory but three of the Union. They have extended into England, Scotland, Spain, Syria, Japan, China, Africa, and Micronesia. Their most rapid growth in this country, in the past year, has been in the Mississippi and Pacific States. The diffusion has been equally broad among the various Christian communions. Those now included are the Congregational (which has, thus far, more than a third of the whole number), Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Reformed, Christian, Lutheran, Friends', Episcopalian, Moravian, Unitarian. The fraternal spirit thus promoted is among the richest fruits of the movement.

A quite recent feature of it is the State conventions. These, while they, of course, concentrate upon the discussions a larger number of strong minds than any local organization, on the other hand deal more thoroughly than is possible in the National Convention with wants and opportunities in their own section of country. Unions of

local societies in each town, city, or county, which also are rapidly multiplying, draw young believers of various sects into close affiliation.

The prescribed age for admission into the local organizations is rapidly diminishing. Junior Societies of Christian Endeavor are forming among younger children than were at first contemplated. The young ladies are assuming more prominent part than a year or two since. In most of the organizations they now take their full turns in the leadership of the prayer-meetings. Meanwhile it is gratifying to see that the young people are holding themselves closely loyal to their several churches, are distributing whatever charitable funds they collect only through the churches, and are allowing nothing to weaken their affection for them.

This movement has been found specially useful on mission-fields. Measures are to be taken to urge forward more rapidly the gathering of local organizations in the mission churches.

Another special service of these societies is the reviving of waning and dying churches in rural districts of the United States. The reports of such work successfully done are many and of remarkable interest. The consecrated enthusiasm of youth seems to avail where the dispirited languor of riper years had completely failed.

DR. W. GLADDEN'S PARISH PROBLEMS.

Reference has been already made by Prof. Fisk, in this volume, to Dr. W. Gladden's *Parish Problems*. But so many of the problems fall within the present department, and are so well handled, as to require notice in this paper.

In regard to "Vagrant Pastors," or irresponsible adventurers, preying on the churches, Dr. Gladden urges that no one be admitted to any pulpit whose name does not appear in the authorized minutes of the denomination to which he claims to belong. He would have church committees increase their vigilance against a stranger with no sufficient credentials, who often captivates a congregation with his few show sermons. The first aim of these prowlers is to "get a hearing." That is the very thing which the committee should refuse. All that any wolf wants is free access to the fold. Give him that, and he will manage the rest of the business for himself.

Under the title "Stealing a Minister," Dr. Gladden objects to the notion that a minister, because temporarily out of service, is of course a man of no power. Such a man may be the one beyond all others whom a vacant church should seek. And, in regard to the complaint often raised by a church from which its pastor has been called away, Dr. Gladden justly says that, in many a case, he ought to have been so called. No army could be officered without admitting the policy of promotion. When a pastor has filled and overflowed a smaller field, give him charge of a larger. But it would be well if a stronger church, calling from a weaker one its pastor, should confer with it fraternally, proving some other right than that of might, and evincing a full Christian sympathy.

As to "Ministerial Bureaus," or agencies intermediate between churches and clerical candidates, Dr. Gladden thinks our ministers are too sensitive. They assume that a Bureau is consulted only by feeble churches, that there is a loss of self-respect in accepting its services, and that it is better to rely on one's own resources and methods in

securing a pastorate. Ministers of such ability as to be masters of the situation are few. Why should not others, less favored, instead of "standing all the day idle," avail themselves of any honorable way to employment?

On the conduct of the Parish Business, Rev. Austin Abbott finds the tendency to be toward the control of such business by the church itself, with no ecclesiastical society. At least in Congregational churches in our cities, this is hardly the fact. It is certainly desirable — wherever pew-holders, who are not church members, will bear "taxation without representation." Under the New York statute, women, as well as men, who are of full age, are regular attendants at and pecuniary supporters of the church, have right to vote on its temporal affairs. Mr. Abbott has much good counsel, for which we have no space, as to the management of church business.

In regard to Parish Ways and Means, Mrs. Lawrence advocates the free-seat and envelope system. But she acknowledges that many churches prefer the pew-renting. And it is certain that not a few churches which have tried the former method have reverted to the latter.

Mr. E. C. Gardner, in five articles on the Parish Buildings, would have the church of durable material, the interior so constructed that the minister could be seen from every sitting, and the choir and organ near him. On light, heating, and ventilation he has much good suggestion.

On Unproductive Property, Mr. Austin Abbott pictures to us a fine church on one street corner, and opposite a building of the same cost, containing a saloon, concert-hall, billiard-room, and faro-bank. The business block is open about a hundred hours in the week — the church about four. What hope is there that the latter can with-

stand the attractions of the former? The evangelical churches of this country have some \$350,000,000 invested in ecclesiastical property. How shall it be made to pay the Lord and mankind a better dividend on the investment? Our author seems to despair of much improvement in this respect. The fact is, four hours a week is an understatement of the time during which our larger churches, especially, are in service. There is a great and increasing number of such churches in which the furnace-fires, in the cold months, hardly go out from week to week.

On the Study and Pulpit, Dr. T. T. Munger admonishes the congregation to leave the pastor undisturbed in study-hours, insists that fewer sermons be required, that the pastor be relieved from all needless causes of worry, that he have liberty of thought and speech without persecution for heresy, and that he be heard with a candid and teachable spirit.

Prof. Llewellyn Pratt, on Pastoral Visitation, urges "that visits be professional, but, at the same time, free, friendly, and unsteretyped; that they be impartial, so that all, rich and poor, young and old, men and women, may be made to feel that they have a pastor; that they be brief and to the point, so that, in a reasonable time, the whole congregation may be reached without detracting from thoroughness in pulpit preparation; that they be considered so confidential that the pastor in them may be trusted as a safe and honorable friend and adviser; that they be governed by some regular plan that shall be understood by the people; and that the system be carried out with such persistence that the whole parish may be reached, and yet with such flexibility as to enable the

pastor to use providential opportunities. The advantages of such visitation he makes to be (1) the personal benefit to the pastor himself, (2) the effect on his preaching, (3) that such visits reach many whom the preaching misses, (4) their practical connection with conversions and revivals, (5) their use in cementing more closely the pastoral relation.

Mrs. Lawrence has much good counsel as to funerals. She would have them inexpensive (which is best attained by private interment, an hour or two, or even the next day, after the public service); held on a secular day, at an hour which shall meet the convenience of the officiating clergyman, who ought to be previously consulted; without funeral sermons; and without the dismal tokens of gloom so commonly thrown around them.

Rev. Dr. G. R. Leavitt, on *Organizing the Church for Work*, holds that the requisites for success in this are, (1) a cheerful response by the church to the pastor's plans, (2) obedience on the part of individuals in the flock, (3) the spirit of work, or an enthusiasm for organization. Then follow certain "regulative ideas," which he counts indispensable: (1) The importance of delay and deliberation, that the new plan may be fully understood and unanimously adopted, (2) the wisdom of variation of plans to suit occasions, (3) the need of the Holy Spirit to forward every enterprise.

Rev. Dr. Reuen Thomas has a paper on the Church Porch, in other words, an organization of the youth and children, which shall serve as a training-school preparatory to active church membership. It would, as he describes it, be practically (though with a less cumbrous name) a Young People's Society for Christian Endeavor.

Rev. Dr. F. P. Woodbury, on the Pastor and the Community, says, "A pastor takes energetic hold of a movement among the overworked salesmen of his town for shorter hours of toil, and, unexpectedly to himself, finds scores of young men and women in his evening services, listening to his words with new openness of attention and sympathy. A pastor stirs up the need of a better school-system, and makes himself a place in the hearts of hundreds of parents which no preaching would have given him. A pastor heads a movement for a public reading-room or library, a society for the wise and systematic relief of the poor, a town-hospital, a reform in civic politics, or a plan of evening schools for working-boys, — anything which shows that he is at work with all the people and for all the people, and he finds, years afterward, when an insidious attempt is made to dislodge him from his work, a large and unlooked-for reinforcement of public indignation in his behalf, which nullifies the attack and leaves him more firmly established than ever." Dr. Woodbury has some excellent practical suggestions to any minister proposing a special scheme for the public interest: —

1. Begin with an obvious need, without searching around after some other.
2. Study the case so thoroughly that any one you invite to aid you may see that you are fully informed.
3. Become familiar with the best literature that is germane to your plan.
4. Find out the few persons, of largest influence and most intelligent views, on whom you may rely for coöperation.
5. Settle firmly on no plan at first, or till after consultation with your assistants. Expect delays, vacillations, partial defeats, and take the consolation of having done your duty.

Dr. Gladden, on Helping the Pastor, urges constant

attendance at all church services. He has also a protest against the reluctance of capable men, both in State and Church, to take office. Their two chief hindrances, he thinks, are a selfish parsimony of their time and labor, and an unreasonable diffidence. In regard to pastoral visiting, he pleads that, in a large church which throws many cares on the minister, this visiting should be mainly done (except in cases of special affliction, or the need of Christian counsel) by the people themselves.

Dr. Gladden, on the question, supposed to be raised by an individual Christian, How to Begin Work? would have him begin by joining the church and putting himself into relation with his brethren. The church should have nothing in its creed or rules which would exclude any true disciple of Christ. After uniting with the church, let the new member look into the departments of the common work and enter on that for which he has most adaptation.

Dr. H. M. Scudder has an admirable paper on the Mid-week Service. We should be glad to transfer it verbatim to these pages. The following are bare head-lines of his suggestions:— 1. Make a *study*, with enthusiastic interest, of your prayer-meeting. 2. Put in the pews a printed schedule of the subjects for about three months. 3. Be prompt in commencing and closing the meeting. 4. Give your exposition of Scripture in the early part of the evening. 5. Have a good hymn-book and be thoroughly master of it. 6. Have your musical instrument and leader close beside you. 7. Insist on short prayers and remarks. 8. Invite all, ladies included, to take part—get the timid to do it without rising. 9. If necessary, have a committee of half a dozen (or less) for each one of a succession of weeks, who shall be responsible for a part in the meeting.

10. Have a social talk, especially with strangers, immediately on the close of the meeting. 11. And through all ask the Holy Ghost as your inspiration.

Dr. Gladden advises a Fellowship-Meeting, for members of the church exclusively. After opening services of song and prayer, the whole meeting should devote a half-hour to conversation. No introductions should be asked or allowed. Christians, already bound in covenant one with another, need no introductions. The subjects of conversation, though they need not be exclusively religious, may be naturally of a more thoughtful cast than those of the Church Sociable.

As to the Annual Business Meeting of the Church, which so notoriously is thinly attended, various schemes for increase of numbers, says Dr. Gladden, have been suggested. One is a collation. But the business to be done will allow no time for that. Moreover, the appeal should be rather to a principle of duty than to the palate. Let the pastor throw his heart into the matter. Let him give the notice of the meeting earnestly, and two or three times on successive Sabbaths. Let the reports, all brief but carefully written, represent every single department of the church work. Let the pastor, in adding his own report, sum up the whole, with any needed comments and appeals. Such a meeting may be one of the most stimulating and profitable of the year.

Dr. Gladden, under the head, Man's Work in the Local Church, discusses the plea of Christian business men: "We can make money. Let us stick to that. Take our money and hire with it such Christian workers as you need." With justice and force he replies that consecrated manhood is as much needed as money.

Dr. Lyman Abbott, on the Mission Work in the Home Field, and the reluctance of the local church to labor in behalf of non-church-goers, well says, "Foreign Mission work not only can but must be done by proxy. Home Mission work not only must not but cannot be done by proxy." He would have no mission school till the rich church has overflowed, with strangers from without, its own accommodations in the home sanctuary.

We should be glad to pursue to the end our review of this most excellent and helpful volume. We are unable, from want of space, to do more than mention a number of articles on Evangelistic Work, by Dr. C. H. Richards, and articles by various writers on the Country Churches, on Societies of Christian Endeavor, on the Church and the Community, on Latent Power in the Churches, ten papers on the Sunday-school, and eleven on Worship, all full of valuable suggestion.

It has seemed to us better to give some clear view of the substance of such papers as we have here introduced than vainly to attempt a more hurried glance at the entire volume. We regard it as the best volume of its kind yet published—far superior to any of the treatises, some of them very voluminous, on Pastoral Theology. Dr. Glad-den has laid the churches under large obligation by the work. We shall rejoice if it finds wide welcome among them.

OXENDEN'S PASTORAL OFFICE.

The Pastoral Office, its Duties, Difficulties, Privileges, and Prospects, by Rev. Ashton Oxenden of Pluckley, Kent, England, is a rather jejune treatise on the work of a rector in the English Church. With the usual round of

remark on the usual category of a pastor's duties within and without the pulpit, there is little fresh suggestion as to methods. In dealing with the question, What constitutes a call to the ministry? the author, bordering somewhat on mysticism, has but slight reference to the qualifications, physical, intellectual, and spiritual, which are the main factors in the problem. A discussion of the matter of recreations confines itself exclusively to the pastor's own personal hours of relaxation, and his duty in regard to them.

CHAPTER III.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL HYMNS.

THE religious journals have been raising the question, of late, whether the sensational style of Sunday-school hymnology ought not to be accounted as having reached its limit. There is something to be said on either side.

As to the tunes, it is certain that Old Hundred and Dundee and Federal Street, and the like, ought not to be expected to meet the whole want of the children. Sprightliness is as natural to them as quiet and deliberation to adults. They have a right to carry this quality into their religion. There is reason, it is true, in all things. They should not be entertained with either music or words answering, for example, to one portentous couplet from a Sunday-school book that occurs to us :—

“O glorious hereafter, thine every bright rafter
Shall shake with the thunder of sanctified song!”

But they may rationally expect such rhythm in the verse, and such melody in the tune, as may prove a fit channel for the consecrated enthusiasm of childhood and youth.

Yet, on the other hand, it must be remembered that the little ones are to share in the worship of the whole congregation. That fact should never be lost from view. And the tunes in our church service will continue to be,

in the main, of those more calm and substantial meters which have won the love of successive generations. Now, if the children are not, when coming into the congregation, to be wearied and repelled by the contrast between such airs and those prevalent in the Sunday-school, then they must be accustomed, in a measure, in the school, to the hymns and melodies in which they are afterward to join. It is gratifying to see that the more recent musical collections for the children are diversified with both the more lively, newer airs and the standard tunes that have stood the test of time.

HOME DEPARTMENT OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

This is a plan or method recently devised for the study of the Scriptures at home, but in connection with the current lessons in the Sunday-school. It owes its inception to Rev. S. W. Dike of Auburndale, Mass. In every parish there is a considerable number of persons who, for various reasons, cannot or will not attend the public services of the school. Invalids, the aged, those living at a distance, and other like classes, it is the aim of this movement to lead to the habitual study of the Bible. A circular is sent to every such person in the parish, explaining the plan, and containing a blank for a pledge in which the subscriber promises to spend, unless unavoidably prevented, at least half an hour each Sabbath in the study of the Sunday-school lesson for that day. A report-card also is enclosed, on which the attendance on this work by the individual or family, for each Sunday, is marked and sent in to the Superintendent. In return, he sends a report of the work of the school, and of the Home Depart-

ment as a whole. Lesson-leaves and other facilities for study are furnished to those who require them. Where the plan is most efficiently carried out, a special superintendent of the Home Department is put in full charge of it.

Several hundred schools, from Maine to Texas, and to Utah, have already connected such departments with themselves. One which is represented in the Hampton, Virginia, Institute has a thousand members. There are in that vicinity several others. The movement is still rapidly extending. The benefits of it are many and valuable. It increases the membership of the Sunday-school. Not a few, who had supposed themselves unable to attend, have their interest in the Scriptures so stimulated by these home-studies as completely to recover from their indifference. One school has increased one-fifth through its Home Department. Invalids, also, are refreshed and comforted. They speak with joy, in their loneliness and isolation, of the cheer it brings them to come thus into coöperation with fellow-disciples. The aged and the young are led, in this method, to bend over the pages of Scripture together. A household of eleven persons, from three generations, one of them acting as teacher, is engaged in the good work. In other cases, backsliders have been recovered. Not a few have been led in conversion to Christ. And so the influence of the Sunday-school has been spread for miles around the place of its assembling.

HAND-BOOKS FOR BIBLE CLASSES.

A series of manuals for the instruction of Bible Classes, with questions appended to each chapter, edited by Rev. Drs. Dods and Whyte, is published by T. & T. Clark,

Edinburgh. They are chiefly exegetical, each volume being devoted to some one book of Scripture. Others are on such themes as The Sacraments, the Confession of Faith, the Reformation, the Shorter Catechism, Church and State, Christian Ethics, The Work of the Spirit, Presbyterianism, The History of Missions. One, on the Church, is prepared by Prof. Binnie, D.D., of Aberdeen. The marks of a true church he makes to be, (a) that the Word of God is purely taught; (b) that the Sacraments are duly administered, though he would not deny to the Friends, who observe no sacraments, the right and title of a true church; (c) the prevalence of vital piety and faithful living among the members. As general principles and rules, he lays down, (1) that, in regard both to authority and vital influence, Christ is the only Head of the Church; (2) that churches of like faith and order ought to associate; (3) that believers removing to a new and distant home ought to unite with some church, even if, from necessity, of a different sect from their own. The chief ends for which the church exists are, for bearing witness to God and his truth, for mutual edification, for Christian worship, and for the conversion of the world to God. Though much of the material of this hand-book would be familiar to many Bible classes in this country, there are thousands of others to which it would be instructive.

The "*Outline Normal Lessons for Normal Classes, Assemblies, Bible Students, and Sunday School Teachers*," by Rev. J. L. Hurlbut, D.D.," may be taken as representative of a series of publications, "The Chautauqua Normal Union," for the use of Normal Classes in which are trained teachers for the Sunday-school. The course of study involves two parts, each requiring a year or possibly less.

Unquestionably one of the most serious clogs on the success of the Sunday-school is the incompetency of teachers. In every large school a considerable number of the teachers are taken partly because no better can be found, partly because it is a less evil that children should be under an incompetent teacher than be excluded from the school. If teachers are to be better fitted for their work, it must be, in part, by methodical instruction. For that purpose this course of study seems to be not ill adapted. We have some query, we confess, as to so much matter crowded into so small space. The teachers who most need thorough instruction are the ones least inclined, in general, to go through it. Two years' study would do them and their classes good. Whether they can be held to it is the question. So immense a number of details as to sacred topography, geography, history, rites and ordinances, apologetics, and as to teachers' qualifications, preparation, principles of instruction, methods of instruction by object-lessons, illustrations, etc., all burden and sorely distract the memory that there is danger of repelling those who should be attracted, and of attempting so much as to accomplish little. Still, as no less than nineteen Sunday-school Summer Assemblies have adopted this course of study, we wait for results, and shall rejoice if experience shall dispel our apprehensions.

CHAPTER IV.

PUBLIC WORSHIP.

UNIFORM TOPICS FOR PRAYER-MEETINGS.

THE great advantages of the uniform International Sunday-school Lessons have been stirring suggestion and invention in other directions. The adoption of these lessons has signalized the Sunday-school work. It has rendered it far more conspicuous in our church life. It has commanded for it the labors of some of our foremost Christian scholars. It has brought it, from week to week, into our secular as well as religious journals. All this, which was impracticable when each school had a separate lesson, has been brought about simply by uniformity.

And now the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, with its already great and constantly increasing expansion, is moving for a scheme of uniform themes for its weekly prayer-meetings. A paper by Rev. H. W. Pope of Palmer, Mass., at their last annual meeting at Saratoga, urges forward this movement. The only serious objection is that occasions are often arising in the local church that call for some special topic. But most rules must allow for exceptions. In the fifty-two weekly meetings in the year, the number of such exceptional occasions would be but a small fraction. If the subjects must be

selected in accordance with "the state of things," it has been well said that commonly there is no "state of things." One topic, helpful to the Christian life, is as timely as another. The pastor is often at a loss for a fresh and awakening theme. For such periods of only average interest in the church the scheme of uniform themes is well adapted.

The advantages of such a plan are obvious. The schedule of texts and subjects would be carefully drawn by competent hands. Suggestive hints would doubtless be added. It is too often the misfortune of the prayer-meeting that the theme is picked up at the last moment under stress of necessity. And the meeting, in consequence, like the bones in the prophet's vision, is "exceeding dry." A rich and fruitful subject will go far, from the outset, to stimulate the service. "Well begun is half done."

This uniformity of subject, also, is inspiring as reminding each local meeting that it is gathered in concert with hundreds, perhaps ultimately thousands, of others elsewhere,—that the same truths are before them, the same or like emotions stirred within. Should uniform themes be adopted by the Young People's Societies of Christian Endeavor, the same themes, if wisely chosen, would commend themselves to the prayer-meetings for adults. This would issue, as in the case of the uniform Sunday-school lessons, in raising those meetings to a more conspicuous prominence and a higher appreciation. It would eventually, also, beget a prayer-meeting literature. It would give rise to quickening and suggestive hints from the best minds in the churches, on the successive themes, as, week by week, they should come up for consideration.

DR. HATFIELD'S "POETS OF THE CHURCH."

This is a Series of Biographical Sketches of Hymn Writers, by Edwin F. Hatfield, D.D.,—a portly and attractive octavo volume of seven hundred and fourteen pages. The material was nearly prepared for the press before the death of the lamented author. The volume will remind readers of another, of about the same size, compiled by Rev. Dr. S. W. Duffield, since deceased, which was reviewed in *CURRENT DISCUSSIONS* for 1886. These two works are by far the fullest and most elaborate known to us, in a department of literature which, though of signal importance, may be said to have come into existence within a quarter of a century.

It is unfortunate for the present volume, by Dr. Hatfield, that it was not first in the field. It suffers by comparison with its predecessor. There are incidental signs of carelessness, as where Wesley's friend, the Countess of Huntington, is disguised in the index as "Mrs. Shirley," and Byron's familiar and beautiful lines in "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers," on Kirke White, are called a "paragraph."

But a more serious fault is in the comparative meagerness of material. One of the most important practical uses of such a work is in the full detail of incidents, clustering about the origin of hymns, which may render it a treasury of information for a conductor of public worship. In this regard Dr. Hatfield's book suffers seriously in contrast with that of Dr. Duffield. The latter has gleaned from every possible source, and thrown every possible ray of light on the origin of whatever hymn he has in hand. In addition, he garners an immense number of anecdotes,

and instances in which the hymn has, in the years since the composition of it, quickened individuals or assemblies. Dr. Hatfield, on the other hand, often gives his whole sketch of an author without a mention of the verses that have most distinguished him. When he does introduce incidents, they are, in general, so familiar as to show little thorough research. His pictures are either without frames or with such frames as add little or nothing to their effect. At the intensely interesting occasion of Cowper's "God moves in a mysterious way," he has hardly more than a glimpse. In his sketch of Addison he appears to have never even heard of Andrew Marvell, and the claim urged in his behalf to the finest of Addison's lyrics, "The spacious firmament on high." Though he includes in his list Dr. James W. Alexander, he passes in silence Joseph Addison Alexander and his startling and solemn lines, beginning "There is a time, we know not when." Neither in his notice of John Wesley nor in that of Toplady does he refer to that bitter controversy between those two excellent men which their names at once suggest. He has (as indeed is true of Dr. Duffield) no mention of Mrs. H. B. Stowe, with her fine hymn, "When winds are sweeping o'er the upper ocean," and others. In the brief biography of Dr. Leonard Bacon he ignores the commemorative hymn at the Second Centennial of New Haven, "O God, beneath thy guiding hand," which will live as long as the English language. He has no mention of Rev. Charles Beecher and his stirring lines, written at Mt. Blanc, "We are on our journey home." Though introducing Dr. O. W. Holmes, he omits reference to the hymn, "Lord of all being, throned afar," with which the Professor at the Breakfast Table closes his conversations.

So in regard to H. Kirke White and the "When marshalled on the nightly plain," which has immortalized him. In some of these cases the hymn referred to is mentioned only in the index, in others not at all. For these and like reasons, though the volume has much valuable matter, we cannot commend it as comparable to that of Dr. Duffield. It is interesting, by the way, as illustrating the precariousness of inferences from intellectual errors to the state of the heart, that we owe to devout Unitarians some of the most valuable and popular of our hymns. To Mrs. Helen M. Williams we are indebted for "While Thee I seek, protecting Power ;" to Mrs. Sarah F. Adams for "Nearer, my God, to Thee ;" to Rev. John Pierpont for "O Thou to whom in ancient time ;" to Sir John Bowring for several, including "How sweetly flowed the Gospel's sound," "From the recesses of a lowly spirit," "God is love ; His mercy brightens," and "In the cross of Christ I glory." Singularly enough for a Unitarian, the first line of this last sublime ode is inscribed on the tombstone of its author.

CHAPTER V.

WORK FOR THE WORLD WITHOUT.

CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

THIS vitally important matter has been discussed by Rev. S. W. Dike in a paper before the American Church Congress, by numerous writers in our religious periodical press, and by others.¹ Without attempting to set forth the various and divergent views of these writers, we suggest only a few seminal principles and points to be noted.

The aim of Christ and his apostles having been to reach and renew the individual, they acted only indirectly and remotely on society in its organic life. They knew, what the world has been slow to discover since, that the whole can be reached only through its parts, that this is a case in which a part is greater than the whole, and that a body politic of vicious citizens, however perfectly constructed, would be a vessel finely modeled out of decaying timbers.

In the first century of our era the time had not arrived for the Christian reconstruction of society. That was to

¹ *Unitarian Review*, Vol. XXVII.; *The Labor Troubles*, p. 327; *The Labor Question*, p. 367; *One Phase of the Social Question*, p. 552; *Homiletic Review* for 1887; *Christianity and Modern Civilization*, by D. S. Gregory, D.D., p. 208. Also, *North American Review*, Vol. 144; *Profit Sharing*, p. 383; *Homiletic Review* for 1887; *Working-men and the Church*, by James Redpath, p. 263; *Relation of the Church to the Labor Problem*, *Lutheran Quarterly Review*, April, 1887.

be a work of ages. But, in nations that have already for centuries enjoyed the Gospel, it is fair to expect that some serious thought and effort will be given to so momentous a reform. It is time for the church to attend no longer exclusively to the individual. There is danger that, as in respect to science, to the anti-slavery movement, and various other great advances, intellectual and moral, of former years, she may be found at least partially behind the age.

Mr. James Redpath, claiming to speak from an intimate acquaintance of thirty-five years with American workmen, from New York to San Francisco, declares that they are in the attitude toward the church not so much of antagonism as of utter indifference. That statement, often repeated in one form or another, has, we fear, too much foundation. The working-men claim to revere the character of Christ. But they deny that the church of our day is the church of Christ. They deny that it is pervaded by his sympathetic spirit toward the masses, or heartily at work, like Him, for their benefit.

It is easy to answer, as with truth we may, that they do not know the church — that they keep too far aloof from it to recognize its spirit. But the fact remains that our professedly Christian business men too often show to their employés their worst side. The large majority, of course, of the business men of the country, as of our population in general, are under no sway of the Christian spirit. Whence it follows that the established principles and usages of business life are those, not of the kingdom of Christ, but of the world. And, too generally, Christian employers have despaired of carrying into the office the same Divine law to which they profess allegiance in the

pew. Their tacit theory has too often been that, so they devote to Christ a good share of the fruits of their business, they must resign themselves to conduct the business itself after the way of the street. We have in mind one who fully recognized his Christian stewardship, and whose praise for beneficence, along many lines, was in all the churches, yet whose spirit toward those in his employ was hard and exacting almost to a by-word.

An essay by Rev. Dr. Washington Gladden, in his *Applied Christianity*, to which volume we may refer more fully below, bears directly on this same matter. From a pretty thorough inquiry, by circular and otherwise, in the city of his residence, he computes that only about thirty-three per cent. of the wage-workers are found in the sanctuary. Of the class of employers, on the other hand, fully fifty-five per cent. attend church. Why this disparity? Is the operative more depraved than the capitalist? There is no evidence of that. Is it that his dress, with that of his family, would mortify him in contrast with the sumptuous raiment of the congregation? Partly perhaps. But the deeper cause underlying all is the profound, widespread conviction that the wage-worker has not his fair share of the enormously increasing wealth of the country. As Dr. Gladden supposes the wage-workers to put it, "We want none of your free seats. We can do without your fine music and your pious commonplaces. We do not greatly care for your hand-shaking in the house of God, and the perfunctory calls of your visitors at our houses. All we want is justice. We want a fair share of the wealth that our labor is helping to produce. . . . And it looks to us as though your sympathies were chiefly given to the people who are getting rich at our expense.

Until our minds are clearer on this score, we shall never be drawn to your churches, charm you never so wisely."

The notion is common that, however philanthropic one's spirit may be, the law of supply and demand must inexorably dominate the relations of capital to labor, of employer to employed. Yet every merchant and manufacturer is continually bending this inflexible law to his own profit. By numberless devices he creates a demand. Too often, by monopolies and "corners," and suspending the work at mills and mines, he reduces a supply. Then, again, by prodigal advertising he increases the demand. He convinces thousands of wants of which they had never before been conscious. This unbending law, of which we hear so much, is largely a fiction. Let one's interest require it to yield, and it is pliable enough on occasion!

Were half the ingenuity and persistence that are applied in these directions devoted to carrying out the Golden Rule, we should soon find that to be as effective as this merciless law of supply and demand. Why should a dead force, working by a sheer inertia, hold in helpless bondage, as the only factor in the problem, a whole generation of active and determined Christian men? It is next in absurdity to the assumption that the laws of nature bar the possibility of the asserted miracles of Christ.

The duty of our pastors is not chiefly to counsel business men as to the best management of their affairs. Such counsel is likely neither to be wise and helpful, nor, if it were, to be accepted. But the pastor has a very evident and urgent duty of insisting on the authority of the Golden Rule in every business establishment. The plea that, in the close competitions of trade, this rule is impracticable, is a direct aspersion on the Master who gave it.

He adds no permission to apply it to one section of our life, and exclude it from another. It reaches everywhere or nowhere.

It is certain that no sufficient light upon present social relations can be had from the methods of Apostolic times. New conditions, always arising, bring in new emergencies and call for new applications of old and immutable principles. And no preacher will be qualified to speak intelligently on these themes who has not informed himself on the social issues and industrial questions of our day.

FRESH BAIT FOR FISHERS OF MEN.

This is a much more helpful volume, edited by Rev. T. B. Makepeace of the Free Church, Andover, Mass. It includes essays by the editor, by Rev. W. L. Gage, D.D., Rev. Smith Baker, Rev. Reuen Thomas, and Mr. C. E. Bolton.

The general theme is the perplexing and vitally momentous one of means and methods with which to reach the non-church-going inhabitants of our cities and larger towns. The keynote of the whole is struck by the editor, in the demand that the church spend less time in advertising theaters by preaching against them, and more in devising something better, to which to invite their patrons. She has thus far done little for the social life of the homeless young people in our cities. The wage-worker can or will go without knowledge, but not without recreation.

What shall his recreation be? Lectures and concerts are beyond the resources of his purse. Ten dollars a week, especially for a husband and father, allow small scope for entertainment at a tenth of that sum in each

instance. The German, cheap, musical concert, which has been recommended by some, can be afforded only when the audience increases the receipts by a liberal patronage of the beer-cask. The Germans give us a lesson in the free use of their churches for musical entertainments of a high order. But whether the trustees of our larger and costlier sanctuaries could be induced to open them to promiscuous audiences for such a purpose is a question.

Rev. Smith Baker presents, as one of the main causes of the ruin of our young men, their homelessness. A youth, going from a rural home to one of our cities, has commonly a cheerless room in a cheap boarding-house, without fire or other comforts. In a long winter evening, tired from the day's drudgery, and seeking recreation, he wanders out on the street. The churches either are closed, or, if open, have no attraction for him. If there is a Young Men's Christian Association room, its main entertainment is reading, for which he is too weary or has no taste. Only the cheap theatre and the saloon, with its flaring lights and free games and social stir, are open with their welcome.

The second peril is from discouragement. A young man who dreams of marriage and a home of his own comes soon to feel that, with the current extravagant notions of expenditure, he is dreaming of an impossibility. He cannot ask a young lady to begin married life where his and her parents began, and patiently work upward. So he halts in single life, with all the perils that surround it.

Rev. Reuben Thomas reports a course of free secular lectures, delivered by himself in London, some years since,

which were attended, through a whole season, by about two thousand people. With these he mingled, largely, moral and spiritual truth. For this latter purpose he commends such lectures as far superior to musical entertainments, which convey no instruction. Such lectures are, in a homogeneous population, like that of England, not liable to one embarrassment that besets them in this country. In our variety of nationalities and of religious sects, there is greater danger of collision with the sentiments of some in the audience.

The three large colleges for working men and women in London are doing incalculable good. When laboring to inaugurate one of these, Rev. F. I. Maurice was ridiculed without sparing. But now, eight hundred carpenters, blacksmiths, and common laborers are pursuing in his institution Greek, French, physical science, political economy, and other more elementary studies.

The churches cannot, as churches, provide the popular entertainment needed. But individual Christians may afford those in their employ the means of instruction and of innocent recreation. Examples of such interest in operatives are not wanting. Messrs. P. Lorillard & Co. of Jersey City, Andrew Carnegie of Pittsburg, the Warner Brothers of Bridgeport, Conn., and others, have done nobly in this behalf. The Cleveland Educational Bureau, described by Rev. Washington Gladden in *The Century* for January, 1885, is another attempt, on a still larger scale, in the same direction. The People's Lecture Course in Andover, Mass., has been maintained three years, with increasing success. Ten entertainments are furnished each season, at fifty cents for the whole, or a half-dime for each evening. Not a cent has been sought or accepted,

to meet expenses, from any source except the sale of tickets. A fund has accumulated from surplus receipts, which is held on deposit, to meet emergencies. A movement is on foot in Chicago for carrying out a similar project on a far larger scale, with the same low rates of admission.

MR. D. L. MOODY'S WORK.

"*D. L. Moody at Home, his Home and Home Work*, by T. I. Shanks," has, first, an account of Northfield Seminary and the summer conventions there held, and, secondly, numerous sketches of the great evangelist's methods of work and teaching. Northfield, his native town, lies just at the junction of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. In the homestead, still occupied by his venerable mother, he seeks recreation for a few months of each summer. But the recreation of Mr. Moody is busier than the work-time of most other men. In the village he has founded the Northfield Seminary for young ladies, which now has nearly three hundred students. In the town of Gill, about four miles away, he has another institution for young men. On the two schools, for sites and buildings, have been expended nearly half a million of dollars. The annual expense to each pupil, for both board and tuition, is \$100. The actual cost, provided for in part by benevolent contributions, is \$160. The special object of these schools is the training of young men and women as lay workers in neglected neighborhoods of city and country. The pupils are from all parts of the Union, many of them from abroad.

The summer conventions, of which the first was held in 1880, occur in August, when the school-buildings, left

nearly empty by the students, accommodate a large number of preachers, teachers, and Christian evangelistic laborers, assembled in fraternal council. The volume abounds in helpful suggestions of plans and methods of Christian work.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

HOMILETICS:
THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

BY

REV. FRANKLIN W. FISK,
PROFESSOR OF SACRED RHETORIC,
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

HOMILETICS.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

So numerous are the works in this department which have come from the press during the year, that it is impracticable to notice them all within the limits assigned to this paper. Hence those have been taken for review that appeared to represent the various phases of religious thought and discussion. Several volumes recently published must be reserved for future notice.

CHAPTER I.

THEORETICAL HOMILETICS.

UNDER the title of *Applied Christianity*,¹ Dr. Washington Gladden has lately given to the press nine essays — or discourses, for such most of them appear to be — on the moral aspects of social questions. These subjects are the following: — Christianity and Wealth; Is Labor a Commodity? The Strength and Weakness of Socialism; Is it Peace, or War? The Wage-Workers and the Churches; Three Dangers; Christianity and Social Science; Christianity and Popular Amusements; Christianity and Popular Education.

To these important topics Dr. Gladden has given special attention, and he discusses them with much intelligence and ability. Since he treats these social questions in their relation to Christianity, the pulpit, as the leader in expounding and applying its principles, has an interest in the discussion.

Under the heading Christianity and Wealth, the author, after noticing the remarkably rapid increase of wealth in Christian lands, and especially in the United States, during the last third of a century, and the “nearly equally constant decline in the proportion of capital which goes to support productive labor,” and that, according to Prof.

¹ *Applied Christianity. Moral Aspects of Social Questions.* By Washington Gladden. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1886.

Cairnes, under the present industrial system, the rich will be growing richer, and the poor, at least relatively, poorer, and that to bring about a better condition of things little more can be asked of the State than it now does, gives it as his conviction that "the Christian moralist" (and so the preacher) "is, therefore, bound to admonish the Christian employer that the wage-system, when it rests on competition as its sole basis, is anti-social and anti-Christian." He maintains that the solution of the difficult problem how to make the interests of both employer and workman identical "is quite within the power of the Christian employer. All he has to do is to admit his laborers to an *industrial partnership* with himself *by giving them a fixed share in the profits of production*, to be divided among them, in proportion to their earnings, at the end of the year." "They would expect of him," the author adds, "to reap the benefit of his superior power; and they would understand that his accumulations must be sufficient to enable him to meet the losses occurring from time to time, which they could not share." This system of co-operative industry is Dr. Gladden's solution of the great labor problem, which he brings forward again and again in his next four lectures. While he would not think it necessary that the pulpit advocate this system of industrial partnership (unless now and then by a carefully prepared lecture on the subject), he would have "more preaching of the law of Christ, in its application to the relations of men in their every-day life."

On the other hand, Prof. Henry W. Farnam of Yale College, in an able article in *The New Princeton Review* (July, 1886), on The Clergy and the Labor Question, says, in words that should be well pondered: "Profit-sharing

and co-operation seem to be favorite remedies at the present day, and every new attempt to introduce one or the other is hailed as a great step toward the solution of what is called the labor problem. I would not discourage profit-sharing or co-operation in the least, for I believe in them thoroughly. But I do not believe that they are the solution of the labor problem, simply because I do not believe that the problem has a solution. Profit-sharing may be the cure for some of our troubles, but it is a remedy which admits of but a limited application. It should be remembered, by those who talk so glibly about the duty of profit-sharing, that the term itself implies profits to share. Many enterprises, however, we know, are run temporarily at a loss. Many are run permanently at a loss, and finally fail. In the year 1885 there were no less than 11,116 failures in the United States, with assets amounting to \$55,265,102, and liabilities amounting to \$119,120,700. Now, profits are *ex vi termini* the share of the manager, of the person who assumes the risk, and who is called in French the *entrepreneur*. Profit-sharing, therefore, implies a share in the risk of which the profits are the reward, and its logical counterpart is, therefore, loss-sharing. But it is very doubtful if wage-receivers, as a whole, would be willing to exchange the relatively sure remuneration which they now get, for the chances of sharing in a profit which might at any time be turned into a loss."

Prof. Farnam forcibly uses the *argumentum ad hominem* thus: "The utterances of a good many of the clergy seem to indicate that, if there were more Christianity in the world, there would be no cause for labor troubles. The fact is that Christian churches are guided in their business

transactions by the same law of supply and demand that guides the most soulless corporations. Churches pay high salaries to talented ministers, because they are scarce, and low salaries to dull ministers, because they are plenty ; and if the church ceases to like its pastor, it turns him out upon the cold world ; sometimes, we regret to say, with little regard for his own comfort or the reasonableness of its complaint." He adds, "There is, undoubtedly, a great amount of suffering in the world, and the clergy cannot call too much attention to it, or insist too strongly upon the duty of every citizen to consider the welfare of his fellow-men. But we should remember that suffering and misery have always existed, and that there is probably now less suffering per capita among the artisan classes than there ever has been before in the history of the world. If this is the case, it is futile to indulge in wholesale denunciations of the industrial system, as if it were the source of all our evils, and as if a mere change of system would bring about the millennium."

We fully believe, with Dr. Gladden, that "Christ's law, faithfully applied to the relations of workman and employer, will settle the whole question," but then, when that comes to pass, the millennium will have come, and all workmen and employers will have the mind of Christ. Meanwhile, the pulpit, as the interpreter of the Christian doctrine and ethics, and the leader of the Christian forces, should keep itself abreast of the thinking and movement of the age on these industrial and economic questions, and, while not advocating any particular system, should fearlessly and faithfully apply the teachings of Christ to men in all their business, as in all their other social relations.

In his essay on "Christianity and Popular Amusements," our author would not have the church undertake "to regulate amusements by drawing the line between the clean and the unclean," but only to "insist on a few general principles in regard to them." He adds, "The Church must use reason rather than authority; and the pulpit can do no better than faithfully to enforce some such general maxims as I have suggested." After discussing the influence of the drama as it is, he remarks, "So far as the drama is concerned, therefore, I fear that it must be said that the net result of its influence upon the national character is injurious rather than beneficial."

He earnestly advocates the furnishing by Christian citizens of "diversions that shall be attractive, and, at the same time, pure and wholesome;" and he gives as an example of remarkable success in the way of popular entertainment the work done by "The Cleveland Educational Bureau," by which, at a very small sum for a season ticket, four or five thousand of the working-people of Cleveland are furnished, during ten Saturday evenings, with a "four-fold intellectual treat" of varied exercises, such as music, addresses, lectures, and discussions. This is a movement in the right direction, and indicates what may be done in this way by the Christian public, under the general lead of the churches and ministry, to purify and elevate society, and opens a vast field for Christian enterprise and usefulness.

Dr. Behrends, in his able lectures on *Socialism and Christianity*,¹ delivered in Hartford Theological Seminary,

¹ *Socialism and Christianity*, by A. J. F. Behrends, D.D., Pastor of Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. New York, The Baker & Taylor Company.

agrees in the main with Dr. Gladden as to the causes and the cure of Socialism. He would have the religious leaders of the people acquaint themselves with the industrial and social problems of our day, so as to be prepared to apply the principles of the New Testament to their solution. That the author, amidst the pressing duties of a city pastorate, has done what he recommends to other ministers, these lectures furnish abundant evidence. He sees no hope, apart from Christianity, of warring successfully against Socialism. "It cannot be stated too often and too strongly that measures looking to the reduction of the hours of labor, the increase of wages, the protection of women and children, and the like, are as futile to satisfy the demands of modern socialism as husks can quiet the cravings of a hungry and starving man, or the lengthening of his chain can tame a lion. The ground thus gained will be held only that the battle may be more vigorously pushed. The needed reforms are many and pressing; they have been delayed too long, and they are granted with an unmanly reluctance; but unless we are prepared to hail a radical revolution in industrial society as heralding the millennium, we must accept the gage of battle against the fundamental articles of the socialistic creed, against its materialistic philosophy, its theory of wealth, and its hostility to private property in land and machinery. So long as these doctrines are not discredited by a severe and merciless logic, we are busy only in erecting our own scaffolds and digging our own graves" (p. 260).

The chapter on Modern Socialism, Religion, and the Family, is especially suggestive and instructive; and the volume is worthy of careful reading by a minister who

cannot find the time to consult the many works referred to by the author.

*Parish Problems*¹ is an octavo volume of nearly five hundred pages, containing "Hints and Helps for the People of the Churches." The work is the joint product of more than a score of authors, several of whom are recognized as authorities on the topics of which they treat. It is well edited by Dr. Washington Gladden, who has contributed seventeen of the seventy-seven sections of which the book is composed, and those are among the best. The volume is divided into nine chapters, with the following titles: The Pastor's Call; Parish Business; Parish Buildings; The Pastor at Home; The Pastor at Work; Helping the Pastor; The People at Work; The Sunday School; Worship. These subjects in their various relations are ably discussed by well known writers.²

The editor, in his Preface, tells us that "the purpose has been to make a book that every pastor would wish to see in the hands of every member of his flock, and that no church officer — no elder or deacon or warden, no steward or trustee, no Sunday-school superintendent or teacher, no mission-worker, no chorister or organist, no active helper in any department of church work — could afford to do without." This purpose seems to us to have been accomplished. We know of no other book that discusses

¹ *Parish Problems: Hints and Helps for the People of the Churches.* Edited by Washington Gladden. New York, The Century Co.

² Mrs. Margaret Woods Lawrence, Austin Abbott, Esq., Mr. E. C. Gardner, Drs. T. T. Munger, Llewellyn Pratt, G. R. Leavitt, Reuben Thomas, F. P. Woodbury, H. M. Scudder, A. H. Bradford, H. C. Haydn, Lyman Abbott, C. H. Richards, H. T. Satterlee, Josiah Strong, J. H. Vincent, A. F. Schauffler, A. E. Dunning, Prof. W. S. Pratt, Revs. J. K. Nutting, F. E. Clark, R. G. Green, and Prof. W. F. Sherwin.

so fully and so well the many subjects that concern pastor and people, and on which every church member should be well informed. If such a misnomer were allowable, the volume, from its chief aim, might have for its title, Pastoral Theology for the People, since its topics are viewed mainly from the position of the church members. Many things are said that every member of a parish ought to know, and that a pastor cannot well say; and they are set forth in a way that must be corrective, stimulating, and helpful.

Our space will not permit a notice in detail of the many sections of the volume. Most of them have to do with problems that lie rather in the domain of Pastoral Theology than of Homiletics. The section on Study and Pulpit, by Dr. Theodore T. Munger, is very suggestive and instructive, and would make an admirable "charge to the people." Although it would seem almost out of place to name certain sections, when all are so good, we cannot forbear to notice, as of special excellence, the article on Mission Work in the Wide Field, by Dr. H. C. Haydn; that on Mission Work in the Home Field, by Dr. Lyman Abbott; that on Evangelistic Work, by Dr. C. H. Richards; and the sections on Latent Power in the Churches, and Coöperation with Other Churches, by Dr. Josiah Strong. Dr. Abbott strongly advocates mission churches, but in the sense in which *every* church should be throughout its entire membership a mission church. He well says, "The great difficulty in the way of mission work in the home field is the lack of a will to do it. Where there's a will there's a way. The problem is not so much to find a way as to create a will. The greatest difficulty lies inside the church, not outside." He adds, "These

two principles, I believe, must be recognized and applied in all mission work in home fields ; personal contact is the power, Christian households are the end." He then indicates some of the methods to which these principles will lead. "First. The church which is possessed of a live missionary spirit will not attempt to establish a mission outside, until it has exhausted its own church resources for missionary work." Second. It will "make the pews free." Third. It will "go out into the highways and hedges, and compel the people to come in ; and that word *compel*, which is our Lord's, indicates that this requires patience, persistent effort under various discouragement."

Dr. Richards urges "that a church should keep constantly before it the fact that the work of ingathering is its first duty ; afterwards comes the work of training, upbuilding, and directing in ways of usefulness." Hence, "A deeply evangelistic spirit, then, should pervade its ordinary and regular work. It should be watching and working for souls continually." It "will not be satisfied with work done for the select circle of its regular attendants alone," but will reach out in every way possible to bring the surrounding floating population under the power of the Gospel. It may think it best "to transform the Sunday evening meeting into a special evangelistic service to attract and benefit this class." And then it should watch for times of special religious interest, when it should employ, if needed, a wise evangelist to aid in gathering in the harvest.

As to the question "How Many Services?" Mrs. Lawrence strongly advocates having but one sermon on the Sabbath, and brings forward as evidence that the change from two sermons a Sunday to one, when made, has been

productive of good results, the fact that, "in conservative Massachusetts, of the five hundred and twenty-three Congregational Churches, four hundred and fifty have come into this arrangement." Still, we cannot but think that a single sermon a week is insufficient to meet the spiritual needs of a church and congregation that should have, in order to deepest impression of religious truth, "precept upon precept, line upon line." Certainly, in cities and large towns, churches, surrounded as they generally are by a considerable population not wont to attend public worship, should have an evening service in which the sermon and the other parts of the service are especially adapted to this class of people. If such sermon were brief, and delivered without notes, the preparation of it would not add greatly to a pastor's labors.

We close our imperfect notice of this volume of *Parish Problems*, by again expressing the conviction that it is a work of unusual value to both pastor and people.

THE STÖCKER SERMON DISTRIBUTION.

The Andover Review (May, 1887) has an interesting communication from its correspondent ("Cadmet") in Berlin, Prussia, giving an account of The Stöcker Sermon Distribution, which had its origin in that city. "An effort to reach non-churchgoers, and to provide them with some special religious instruction on the Sabbath, has been lately made in Germany by Court Preacher Stöcker, and is meeting with great success. Five years ago the work was initiated by him on a comparatively small scale. He began to publish every week, at the bookstore of the Berlin City Missionary Society, a little tract consisting of

a sermon and the accessory parts of a church's service, viz., passages of Scripture, prayer, and hymn. The tracts are in a cheap form, — simply eight printed pages without covers, — and are sold, to whoever will distribute them, at the rate of four copies for a cent. The sermons were for the first two years selected, then for three years written by Stöcker himself, and during the coming year they are to be taken largely from the sermons of Hofacker."

The originator of the work, impelled to enter upon it by the conviction that "it is rightly regarded as the greatest and most urgent duty of the present time to bring the Gospel again to the masses," tells us that "God has crowned the work with grace and blessing. It began as a grain of mustard-seed, now it is a great tree. In December, 1881, in the vestry of the Dom-parsonage in Berlin, some twenty friends, male and female, gathered together; six hundred sermons had been ordered, and were to be distributed on the next morning (Sunday) in the streets of Berlin. With fervent prayer the cause was commended to God; nevertheless some were full of fear and apprehension as to how it would turn out. Glad and grateful all came back on the next Saturday, and others with them. Almost without exception the sermons had been received readily, by many with thanks and joy. For months the distributors came together every Saturday evening, and prayerfully and gratefully recounted to one another the growth of the work. There ceased to be any embarrassment about the distribution; every Sunday morning was hailed with joy. The work rapidly became popular, no one said anything against it; soon there were thousands who were heartily longing for the Word of God."

The work, so auspiciously begun, greatly prospered. "It spread beyond Berlin, beyond Prussia, beyond Germany, into foreign lands among the Germans scattered abroad. At the end of five years over two thousand persons are engaged in the distribution, and 117,000 sermons are issued every week. Of these, 15,460 are distributed in Berlin itself; *i. e.*, some 6800 by the city missionaries, and the remainder by persons of all classes and callings. Of the remaining 101,540, nearly 70,000 are distributed in Prussia; upwards of 21,000 in the other States of Germany, and over 8000 among the German-speaking population of foreign lands. In all there are now distributed weekly some 33,000 copies more than there were a year ago."

We are told that "the appreciation of the sermons by the recipients, and their gratitude for them (expressed both in word and in deed), is often really touching;" that there is abundant evidence that much spiritual good is done by the sermons; and that "the influence of the sermons in bringing persons back to frequent the churches has been very marked." "It is this work" (the correspondent adds), "and others of a kindred character, that are giving force and activity, among the German people, to a current of religious life which is directly counter to the present backward trend in the German universities towards rationalism and indifferentism."

We think that this is a movement in the right direction. Why may it not be equally successful in American, as in German cities? If the masses will not go to the pulpit, why should not the pulpit go in this way to the masses? Already this has been done to some extent by a few city pastors, who have had their sermons printed from week to

week, and scattered among their people. Why is it not feasible for certain pastors of the churches in a division of a large city, by concerted action, to scatter among all the people of that section two or three of their fresh discourses, from week to week? Of course such a work, to be greatly successful, would require no little thought, wisdom, time, and labor; but the result would be, as we believe, an ample recompense for all the expenditure. By this means the pulpit could increase its influence indefinitely, and thus aid in solving the ever recurring problem, "How to reach the masses" with the Gospel.

CHAPTER II.

PRACTICAL HOMILETICS.

THE reputation of the Rev. Dr. Theodore T. Munger, both as a thinker and as a writer, is so well established that his new volume, entitled *The Appeal to Life*,¹ is sure to have a large number of readers. It contains fourteen discourses, on such themes as, The Witness from Experience; Christ's Treatment of Unwilling Skeptics; Truth through and by Life; The Gospel of the Body; The Two-fold Force in Salvation; Faith Essential Righteousness: Evolution and the Faith; Man the Final Form in Creation; and Music as Revelation. These subjects the author treats with much originality of thought and freshness of illustration. No one, we are sure, can read these sermons attentively without being at once charmed with their style, intellectually stimulated by their original and suggestive thought, and spiritually benefited by many of the views of the truths presented.

But we cannot wholly agree with the author in some of his positions. In the Preface he states that "there are three general ways in which the Gospel is presented: the dogmatic way, which interprets the revelation through credal forms accepted as full and ultimate; a simple repetition of the single revelation contained in the Bible, without the interrelation of its truths, and with an impli-

¹ *The Appeal to Life*, by Theodore T. Munger. Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1887.

cation of faith that deprecates thought and requires only arbitrary acceptance; and a third way, that may be called the *vital way*, — that is, truth set in the light of daily life and the real processes of human society. It is not averse to dogma; it accepts with docility the revelation, but it seeks for the vindication and illustration of the truth in the actual life of the world, on the ground that the revelation is through and in this life. It is, in brief, the inductive method" — the method of our author. Now, if, in very truth, this "third way" "accepts with docility the revelation," and only "seeks for the vindication and illustration of the truth in the actual life of the world," meanwhile holding fast to the Scriptures as the revelation of God to man, proved to be such by abundant historical evidence, then not only do we have no objection to our author's method, but we heartily approve of it. For it was the method of our Saviour, and has largely been the method of the best preachers since his time. But if the author means that *only* such parts of the sacred writings as men may find vindicated and illustrated "in the actual life of the world" are they with "docility" to accept as the revealed and inspired word and truth of God, then we must disagree with him. Our Lord revealed many truths which, from their nature, cannot be vindicated and illustrated "in the actual life of the world." We think that the author goes too far when he asserts that "he (Christ) is not only in human life, but he teaches in no other way than by its processes. His actual life *is* the teaching, and his words are only comments upon it; the words are not the teaching." We are told that truth is not actually truth until it gets past the respect properly entertained for dogma, and beyond reverence for an

external revelation, and awakens an intelligent and responsive consciousness of its reality. But does truth depend for its actuality, its existence, upon one's "intelligent and responsive consciousness of its reality"? May there not be Biblical truths of awful import to us, and yet we may not have "a realizing sense" of them? We fear that Dr. Munger, in his effort to vindicate and illustrate the truths of Scripture by human consciousness and experience, will leave upon many readers the impression both that he regards as of little value any other kind of evidence, and that he thinks that whatever so-called truths cannot be thus verified are of little worth.

By following so closely this "inductive method," our author is led throughout these sermons, as we think, unduly to "seek for the vindication and illustration of the truth in the actual life of the world," and thus to the attempt to explain away whatever simple Biblical statements may seem to be at variance with "the actual life of the world." For example, in the first sermon, *The Witness from Experience*, from the text, "Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him, etc., St. Luke xv. 1-11," we are told, "This is natural, — to be glad when the lost is found, — but Christ expands the field of its action, lifts it up to heaven, and calls in the angels. Whether this is the exulting play of the Oriental imagination spiritualizing its visions, and throwing into outward form the ecstasies of the inner soul, or a simple revelation of experiences in another world, it is not necessary to decide. For one, I do not care to make the distinction. It is not improbable that the heavenly fact is the basis of the heavenly vision" (p. 20). Again, in the sermon, *Truth through and by Life*, from the text,

"Then certain of the Scribes and Pharisees answered him, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee, etc., St. Matt. xii. 38-43," we read, "The superior knowledge of Christ did not pertain to such questions" (questions of interpretation of the Old Testament). "His use, by way of illustration, of a name or an incident settles no technical question that may be raised in regard to it; he simply used it as he found it. But the way in which he used any character or incident does settle the moral element or truth involved in the character or incident. For example, Christ here refers to Jonah, but his reference does not indicate how the book of Jonah is to be interpreted, — whether it is to be regarded as historical, or parabolic, or poetical, or mythical, — yet it does confirm and endorse the moral truth involved in the story" (p. 48).

But does it comport with a just conception of Him who was the incarnate Truth to suppose that he would "confirm and indorse the moral truth involved in the story" of Jonah, when he knew that story to be false? Besides, he no more explicitly asserted that "the Son of man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" than that "Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale," or "sea-monster."

In the discourse entitled *The Defeat of Life*, from the texts, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his. — Num. xxiii. 10; Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness. — 2 Peter ii. 15," we read, "With the form of the story we have little to do. But few persons will consider it worth while to pause long upon it; or they will but study it as an illustration of the way in which the ancient Oriental mind embodied subtle moral processes for which it had not yet found any direct

method of expression" (p. 120). And so the author goes on to represent what is generally regarded as miraculous in this story, not as a historical fact, borne witness to as such by the Apostle Peter, when, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, he asserted that "he (Balaam) was rebuked for his own transgression; a dumb ass spake with man's voice, and stayed the madness of the prophet," but as an extravagant form of speech, employed by the ancient Oriental mind to represent a wholly subjective process — "the moral working of Balaam's mind."

In the sermon that has for its subject Faith Essential Righteousness, from the text, "And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness. — Genesis xv. 6," we read, "Of the narrative" ("wrongly named the sacrifice of Isaac"), "we will only stop to say that it matters little where the line of historical reality is drawn, though the greatness and accuracy of the truth it conveys would seem to indicate that it sprang out of an actual experience, and not from some dreaming brain" (p. 194). He adds, "He (man) knows no truth until he has achieved it by experience. Hence, we may justly infer that these truths of faith and sacrifice, as found in the story of Abraham, sprang out of an actual experience" (p. 195). Yet he regards certain details of the story — the conversation represented as having been held between the Lord and Abraham — as existing only in the patriarch's imagination. "He falls into the common notion that the virtue of sacrifice consists in the offering of some victim through which there is loss or suffering; he thinks he cannot express his obligation and gratitude except by some pain inflicted on himself or another, — the old mistake!" (p. 199).

But, in following this method of interpretation throughout the narrative, our author encounters difficult questions which he does not attempt to explain. He remarks: "The vindication of faith that came to Abraham may come to us all. Let us not press in upon the process with intrusive question. Abraham is not required or permitted to do what he had conceived he must do; still he has thus been led up into the very heights of faith and into the secret of sacrifice" (p. 201). Yes, but if Abraham had been impelled (as represented) by a mistaken conscience up to the very act of lifting his arm to slay his son, why "not press in upon the process with intrusive question," to show, if possible, why, consistently with this method of interpretation, he so suddenly dropped his knife? How much better, in all such cases, to take Mr. Webster's view of the Bible, as given in his "Confession": "I believe that the Bible is to be understood and received in the plain and obvious meaning of its passages, since I cannot persuade myself that a book intended for the instruction and conversion of the whole world should cover its true meaning in such mystery and doubt that none but critics and philosophers can discover it."

In the sermon on The Twofold Force in Salvation, from the text, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure. — Philippians ii. 12, 13," the author, in attempting to show "that salvation is an achievement," seems to use the term salvation almost wholly as "perfected manhood," and to lose sight of the assertion of the Apostle Paul, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," and also of our Saviour himself, that "he that believeth on me *hath* everlasting

life." The man who has this new life within him will, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, work out his salvation unto "perfected manhood" in Christ Jesus, but he is a saved man from the start.

As regards the phrase, "For it is God which worketh in you," our author remarks: "We find here one of the plainest illustrations of a doctrine that is now coming into fuller recognition than it has had since its first Hebraic and Christian utterance, namely, the doctrine of the Divine Immanence, or the actual presence and residence of God in all things and beings, the life of all lives, the force in all forces, the soul of all being. The Hebrew nation was steeped in this truth; it made it an inspired nation. Christ planted himself upon it, and gave to it its highest and most spiritual expression. St. John echoes Christ's own words. St. Paul put it into a sharp and eternal definition, 'In him we live and move and have our being'" (p. 178).

But does not the apostle mean more than this when he says to the Philippian Christians that "it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to work, for his good pleasure"? Does he not evidently imply that God is in them as the temples of his indwelling Spirit, in a sense very different from that in which it may be truly said that he resides "in all things and beings," so that "In him we live and move and have our being"?

Having dwelt somewhat at length upon what we cannot but regard as serious defects in these sermons, we turn with pleasure to note some of their excellencies.

Dr. Munger introduces his themes to us in a varied and delightful manner. He felicitously gives us the setting of the text, so that the thought opens before us in a natu-

ral and pleasing way. His expositions often take the descriptive form, and are full of life. Now and then they are unduly protracted, as in the sermon on The Gospel of the Body, from the text, II. Cor. xii. 7, "And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure," — in which, after stating that "it matters little what the thorn in the flesh was ; but how it pierced the apostle, how he bore it, and how it affected him, are the real questions," the author adds, "Still, it may be well to refer to these various theories, if for nothing else than to get rid of them." And then, before getting to his subject, he takes up one-third of his sermon in discoursing on the nature of the thorn in the flesh.

The subjects are generally well stated, though in one or two instances a second statement of the theme, in a narrower sense, is a little confusing. Although our author's divisions of a subject are rarely formal and numerical, yet they are, in general, distinctly and tersely expressed.

In the development of his themes, he is at his best. Here, his fine imagination, his philosophical cast of mind, and his wide reading, unite to awaken special interest in the discussions. Particularly is this the case in the last four discourses of the volume, which treat of Evolution and the Faith, Immortality and Modern Thought, Man the Final Form in Creation, and Music as Revelation. These discourses — not intended for delivery — are among the ablest, most suggestive, and interesting in the book.

The style of our author is, in general, worthy of high

praise. It were easy to quote from every sermon passages of great beauty and force. Epigrammatic sentences, full of wisdom and philosophy, abound. In an author less careful of his style, we should think that such expressions as, "To lightly lose" (p. 15), "to rightly measure" (p. 17), "to unduly exalt" (p. 104), were inadvertencies, but they seem to indicate a prevailing tendency even in good writers.

We have rarely read a volume of sermons with greater interest, though often compelled, in the reading, to dissent from the views of the gifted author.

Dr. Joseph Parker has recently given to the public the fifth volume of *The People's Bible: Discourses upon Holy Scripture, — Joshua — Judges V.*¹ The work contains two discourses on The Great Questions of the Pentateuch, and The Pentateuch as a Whole; twenty-four on selected passages in Joshua, and eight on texts in Judges. To these are added, under the title of "‘Handfuls of Purpose’ for All Gleaners," forty brief and very suggestive notes on special texts.

Under the head of "Excursus," the author ably discusses the three questions of Godhead, Providence, and Inspiration, as they appear in the light of the Pentateuch.

The discourses are preceded by prayers remarkably varied and rich in both thought and expression. But while breathing the spirit of Christ, they are only in a few instances offered expressly in His name.

Since these discourses have the characteristics in thought and style of those contained in the previous volumes of the series, already noticed in CURRENT DISCUSSIONS, it is

¹ London: Hazell, Watson & Viney, 1887.

not necessary to dwell on their characteristics. The author has the happy faculty of seizing upon the salient points of a narrative, and setting them forth with great power. These discourses exhibit abounding good sense and hopefulness of spirit, and are very suggestive in pointing out spiritual lessons from Biblical history. At times the author seems to see too much in a passage, and to be a little fanciful in his application of a text.

This volume we regard as one of the best of the series.

The volume of Sermons to Children entitled *Bible Warnings*,¹ by the Rev. Richard Newton, D.D., is fully equal to his numerous other works. It consists of fifteen sermons on such topics as, The Warning not to Forget God; The Warning against Covetousness; The Warning against Intemperance; The Warning against Lying; and The Warning against Anger. These subjects are set forth chiefly by illustrations. The author begins his sermon by giving in simple and clear terms the meaning of the text, and then, under three or four distinct heads expressed in brief and similar language, he brings out more fully the truth, and impresses it by one or two illustrations under each head, generally in the form of anecdotes. He then closes the sermon with a good recapitulation of the points made, and a very brief application.

Every part of the sermon is full of life, and all the parts tend to make a single impression. The author evidently understands how to address children. He is never dull, never tiresome, but always fresh, interesting, and instructive. He abounds in story and anecdote, often so appropriate as to suggest that they must have been made up

¹ *Bible Warnings*, Sermons to Children. By the Rev. Richard Newton, D.D. New York, Robert Carter & Brothers.

for the occasion. Perhaps these sermons run too much to illustrations, but, numerous as they are, they do not overlay the truth, but serve to render it more luminous.

We commend these sermons as good examples of preaching to children.

The well known Rector of Trinity Church, New York, has recently given to the press a volume of twenty-seven discourses under the title, *Christ at the Door of the Heart, and Other Sermons*.¹ While they are sermons not remarkable either in thought or in expression, they are good examples of faithful and tender presentation of evangelical truth. The preacher is evidently in hearty sympathy with the great doctrines of the Christian faith, and sets them forth with clearness and force. Yet here and there we find the expression of doctrines to which we cannot assent, as "Our Christian life really began, through God's grace, in our baptism, wherein we were made, though unconscious of the blessed truth, the children of God" (p. 93). "Baptism is the one and only election of which the church knows; baptism is the sacrament of regeneration; it *is* our regeneration; it is our death to sin, our new birth unto righteousness" (p. 267).

About one-fourth of these sermons are textual in form. In general, the author has a well defined plan, though he does not make it prominent. He rarely uses argument, and does not abound in illustration. But he is felicitous in statement, and relies upon the truth itself to carry conviction. He appeals often to the heart and the conscience, and applies the truth with great skill and faithfulness. His style is good, clear, and forcible.

¹ *Christ at the Door of the Heart, and Other Sermons*. By Morgan Dix, Rector of Trinity Church, New York. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1887.

The book is one that will repay reading.

*Creed and Character*¹ is the title of a recent volume of twenty-two sermons by the Rev. H. S. Holland, Canon of St. Paul's. In his preface the author says, "Every Christian preacher, of necessity, undertakes the responsibility of representing 'the Mind of Christ.' . . . The Kingdom of Christ is the manifestation of Christ's sole Will: and it must embody these two forms. It is the display, on earth, of a certain body of motives and intentions, peculiar to Christ, co-ordinated into a certain characteristic combination, peculiar to Christ. Where do we find the first of these two forms? In the Creed of the Church. Where the second? In the ethical ideal of the Church; in the Christian character. We are accustomed to abstract these two from each other for logical and temporary purposes; and this abstraction has had disastrous results." Accordingly, the author, in designating his book by the title given it, says, "I desire to offer, by that title, a challenge to all who may happen to read these sermons, to say whether they can possibly contrive to conceive a separation between the Creed herein pleaded and the Character herein portrayed. They may freely criticise the work offered them; or they may discuss the practical possibility of a moral character other and higher than the Christian. But can they ever unravel the threads which knit the Character which we know, in its developed form, as Christian, from the Belief which appears, at every single point of the character, as its inherent and vital groundwork? Can they detect, as they read this book, the transitions by which the Creed passes over into the

¹ *Creed and Character: Sermons.* By the Rev. H. S. Holland, M.A., Canon of St. Paul's. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.

Character? Can they mark the point at which it ceases to be Creed, and becomes Character? 'I live; yet not I; Christ liveth in me.' There is the law which accounts for every jot and tittle of Christian Ethics. And the question which I want to put home is, By what process are you going to drop out of that law its theological, and retain its ethical value?" This we regard as an important truth, well put. With this main purpose in view, the author gives to us two sermons under the heading of Apostolic Witness, seven under that of The Church in the Gospels, seven under the designation Newness of Life, and two under the topic The Christian Life Here on Earth.

These sermons, as a whole, have unusual freshness and originality of thought. They are very suggestive and instructive. They cannot be attentively read without giving enlarged and noble views of the "Mind of Christ," as seen in his kingdom on earth. While the author clearly reveals his high-church tendencies, he is not dogmatic. In Sermon XV., on The Law of Forgiveness, we read, 'Baptism is no seal of a life already restored; it is the act by which restoration is first made possible' (p. 225). "Until I myself repudiate my Baptism and kill out my baptismal grace, I am still a forgiven man. I have not lost my Gift. It is in me still. It is under me. And, again and again, I may have sinned, but, under the covering wings of the Church, through the absolution of God's Priest, I can assure myself of my full renewal, of my perfect pardon. Through Absolution, the enduring efficiency of that baptismal grace, not yet all lost, finds once more its road unhindered, its channels unchoked." So of the Bodily Presence in the eucharist, we read, "Take, eat,

this is My Body ; it is no ghost, it is I Myself, fear not " (p. 319).

His exegesis sometimes seems a little lame. In Sermon III., on the text Matt. xvi. 18, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," we are told that "that Rock is His own Name, the Name of the Christ made known and made alive in the heart of man" (p. 49). At times he seems a little careless in statement. In Sermon XV., on The Law of Forgiveness, we read, "Christ, the Forgiveness, becomes the one forgiven Man" (p. 225).

Perhaps among the best of these able sermons is the second, on The Story of a Disciple's Faith ; the seventh, on The Resources of the Church ; the eighth, on The Mind of the Church ; the sixteenth, on The Coming of the Spirit ; and the twenty-second, on Character and Circumstance.

The structure of these sermons does not seem to us equal to the material. In some cases the form is rather that of an essay than of a sermon. The subject of the discourse is rarely stated distinctly and tersely, or discussed under clear-cut divisions. But the general style is admirable. It is natural, simple, vivid, and forcible. The author has the rare power of so setting forth the simple facts and narratives of Scripture as to make them life-like. Now and then he does not seem sufficiently choice in his use of words, as, for example, "dumfounded" (p. 27), "worsen" (pp. 28, 259), "unshepherded" (p. 47), "unangrily" (p. 126).

These sermons, though open to the criticisms named, have many excellent qualities, and cannot but be helpful to the reader.

The Rev. Arthur Brooks, in his volume entitled, *The Life of Christ in the World*,¹ has given to the public twenty-five sermons, which, while not striking in thought or expression, are, in the main, suggestive and instructive.

Although they are evangelical in tone, they rarely touch the severe — the “hard” — doctrines of Scripture. In this respect they are like the most of the sermons that have recently come from the press. While these discourses do not abound in illustrations, they contain many good ones. The author rarely develops his thought by a course of reasoning, but makes his appeal chiefly to conscience and experience. He seems fond of using texts by accommodation. In six of these sermons, the subjects are gotten from accommodated texts, and in one or two of these the connection appears somewhat forced.

The structure of these sermons is inferior to their material. Few of them have subjects and divisions well stated. Indeed, in some cases, it is hard to find either. The absence, in several of these sermons, of a clearly announced subject and divisions must, as we think, have rendered it somewhat difficult for the average hearer to follow the course of thought.

The style of the author, while simple, is elevated and dignified.

We should designate as among the ablest of these sermons, the first, on The Unity of God's Work in Heaven and on Earth; the second, on The Message of Christ to the Conscience; the third, on The Power of Christ's Words; the tenth, on Jesus' Limitations, His Power and

¹ *The Life of Christ in the World: Sermons.* By the Rev. Arthur Brooks, Rector of the Church of the Incarnation, New York. New York, Thomas Whittaker, 1887.

Glory; the thirteenth, on The Christian Rule of Life; and the twentieth, on Christ's Flight into Egypt.

Under the title of *Man's Knowledge of Man and of God*,¹ the Rev. Dr. Richard Travers Smith has recently given to the press a volume of six discourses delivered before the University of Dublin.

As stated in the introductory lecture, the aim of the author, in these discourses, is to show that "we know God in the same way as we know man. It is an argument from analogy, and seeks to recommend religion by reason of its agreement with the experience of life" (p. 1). Remarking that "Bishop Butler makes an assumption which is so far from being considered allowable in the present state of thought that it gives opportunity to some of saying that the usefulness of his work has passed away," he modestly says: "To underpin his work with a proof of the being of God by means of the same great principle on which the rest of the structure depends must be the office of some mind as great as his. But the matter is of such importance that to give a few humble hints towards its solution, or even to start the question, may be better than to have remained silent on it. The object, then, of the following pages, will be to show, firstly, that there is such an analogy between belief in personal man and in a personal God, that whoever accepts the one is thereby proved capable of attaining to the other; and, secondly, that not only do the same difficulties meet us in believing human personality as those we have to face in

¹ *Man's Knowledge of Man and of God: Six Discourses delivered before the University of Dublin at the Donellan Lecture, 1884-5.* By Richard Travers Smith, D.D., Vicar of S. Bartholomew's, and Canon of S. Patrick's, Dublin. London and New York, Macmillan and Co., 1886.

believing that of God, but the perplexities in our knowledge of human nature are inexplicable unless we follow that knowledge out into that divine sphere to which its analogies lead us " (p. 28-29).

Our author shows that, in spite of the sympathies we have with nature, we restrict our personality to man ; that we found it first in our own self-consciousness, and then ascribed it to other men ; and that, in the last resort, the meaning of the phrase, " I myself," runs up into mystery.

In the second discourse, on Self-Knowledge, the author, having noted the two aspects in which we are presented to ourselves, — historically, as filling a place in the world, and actively, as mysterious agents, setting the forces of the world in operation, — goes on to show that, though this mysterious subjective self cannot be directly known as a subject, yet it is that which we have in daily use ; and that the will is the working power of the self, and, like the self, is a mystery which transcends thought. In the battle of life, he terms the self the warrior, the talents his weapons.

In the third discourse, on Knowledge of Men, it is shown that, while the self seeks help from the outer world, the passage to it is a mystery ; that matter, life, intelligence, mathematical truth, are mysteries ; that we must be in contact with a source of knowledge beyond the sensible world, as in the perception of beauty and of right. How, then, it is asked, do we know other men ? It is answered that, while much of this knowledge of men comes from sensible observation, that of their personality cannot come from that source ; that, while we cannot have the consciousness of their personality which we have of our own, there must be in us an instinct for recognizing

persons as mysterious as our personality itself ; and that, while we must know the physical laws which govern other men's lives, we must also cultivate faith in them as persons. The author thus sums up the result to which he has come : " Man's recognition of the personality of his fellow is a faith. It is in itself a kind of religion. We have to overpass sight in order to gain it. It is something which cannot be proved. But it is that on which depends all that is noblest and happiest in human life " (p. 130).

In the fourth discourse, the author supports the proposition that We Know God through Self-Knowledge. The mystery of personal life points to further mystery. Belief in the supernatural is natural to man. Nature does not cover the whole field. " Has nature," says the author, " really so closed us in that there is no direct access to God any longer possible ? It is not so. There remains still a direct communication with Him open through our personality, that mysterious self which abides with us all through life, and comes into action in every moment. Here lies a spot on which physical science has not planted its flag. Here is something within the bounds of nature for which nature does not account. It is an open road to the regions beyond nature. And the gap in the circle which nature draws around us is large enough to admit religion with all its ensigns, and its divine Captain at its head " (pp. 141-2). Man reaches God through man. The first step from the mystery in human life to religion is found in the mere sense of mystery ; the second, in the necessity of connecting the mysterious self in its active character with some power and cause beyond ; the third step is found in this — that the moral nature of man im-

parts a practical character to the demand of a cause of personality. The formation of conscience cannot be due to natural evolution, and conscience tells us that we are responsible, not to society and not to ourselves chiefly, but to a mysterious authority beyond our life. Our personality demands a personal God, our moral nature a moral God.

In the fifth discourse, in which our author defends the proposition that We Know God in Nature and Man, he shows that the fourth step from the mystery in human life to religion is found in the fact that man must be regarded not only in his separation from nature, but in his connection with it ; that this connection demands a cause ; that man in nature must represent God in nature. The will of man, moulding nature in conformity to natural law, gives us a kind of model in miniature of that divine power in which the whole wonderful system originates. The author denies that this way of thinking about God is justly subject to the imputation of anthropomorphism.

To the inquiry whether this view leads us to a God who is limited by nature, the author replies that, "Nature must be regarded as something objective to God, even as she is to us. And God's power in nature, however high above ours, yet must be thought of as limited and conditioned like ours, by the conditions of the instruments with which He has to work " (p. 191). But he confesses that "it is not possible to deny that such an admission is of necessity destructive of the attempt to ascribe to God an absolute omnipotence in nature." Yet he claims that he is not therefore compelled to recognize as God a being of great though still imperfect power and goodness. As a Father of spirits, God cannot be subject to conditions or limita-

tions ; but as a God of nature, He must by that very fact be subject to limits in His action. This combination of the perfection of God with the imperfection of nature the author terms an inexplicable puzzle, yet so only for the intellect. He goes so far as to admit that the existence of evil gives us a God who has the same enemies that we have to contend with, and that we are thus brought into sympathy with Him in this great conflict with evil. It seems to us that our author, in attempting to carry out his analogy, concedes too much when he admits that the Being who created nature may not have absolute control over it. The fifth and last step from the mystery in human life to religion is found, our author thinks, in the natural desire to meet personality everywhere ; and the power of personal communion between man and man, and the desire for its extension, finds its cause and source in God.

In the sixth and last discourse, which has for its subject God Revealed, the author proceeds to show that knowledge of man is not merely knowledge of the instruments he works with, but of himself ; that we know God in a similar manner, subjectively as well as objectively ; and that revelation is the only means of knowing either man or God. He attempts to show that the form of religion in which the question whether religion satisfies the wants of our personality may best be tested is, in the essence of its doctrine, the Catholic faith ; and that the reason that this creed has met with such acceptance and exercised such power is because it has carried out and satisfied, in the spiritual sphere, those habits and tendencies which are fostered in man by his experience of life and his intercourse with other men. It corresponds to the essential forms under which personality meets us in life. The

Father above, the brother beside, and the self within — the elementary forms without which human nature cannot exist, and which human life fails to fill up and complete — find at once their cause and completion in the forms of the Divine Personality, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And yet, the origin of the Christian creed was found not in human wants, but in revealed facts.

We have given an outline of the thought in these able discourses quite fully, and almost wholly in the words of the author, because such a course seemed necessary in order to put our readers in possession of the argument. We think that no one can read this volume with the careful attention it deserves, without being impressed with the cogency of the argument, and the ability with which it is set forth ; and, though he may not accept all the positions of the ingenious author, he will find the book very suggestive and instructive.

Although these discourses have texts of Scripture prefixed to them, they are more in the form of lectures than of sermons. The author is remarkably happy in his illustrations ; and, in the discussion of themes somewhat abstruse, has a clear and attractive style.

*The Marriage Ring*¹ is the expressive title of a volume of fifteen discourses by Dr. T. De Witt Talmage, on the following themes : The Choice of a Wife ; The Choice of a Husband ; Clandestine Marriage and Escapades ; Duties of Husbands to Wives ; Duties of Wives to Husbands ; Costume and Morals ; Easy Divorce ; Motherhood ; The Martyrs of the Kitchen ; and the like.

These subjects Dr. Talmage treats in a manner wholly

¹ *The Marriage Ring : A Series of Discourses in Brooklyn Tabernacle.* By T. De Witt Talmage. New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1886.

his own. On these delicate themes he is not afraid to speak out the whole truth. Yet, while fearless, he is regardful of proprieties. He shows throughout these discourses or lectures a rather remarkable knowledge of society, domestic life and relationships, and says what he has to say about them in a frank, interesting, and instructive manner. He is never wearisome, and, though he may sometimes offend a refined taste, he must command at once the reader's respect by his fearless faithfulness, and his sympathy, as also by the tenderness with which he speaks of his own father and mother.

These sermons have the general and striking characteristics of the productions of the author, which, as they have been repeatedly noticed in former volumes of *CURRENT DISCUSSIONS*, need not here be dwelt upon.

The Rev. Dr. William M. Taylor, in his volume of discourses on *The Parables of our Saviour*,¹ has done excellent service to both pulpit and pew. The work consists of twenty-eight discourses on the parables of our Lord, delivered on as many Sabbath evenings to the congregations that thronged the Broadway Tabernacle. Although the preacher has gone over fields that have been often gleaned, yet he has gathered for us many golden sheaves. Indeed, we think that he specially excels in expounding and illustrating these sayings of our Lord.

His usual method is first to set forth clearly the meaning and scope of a parable, and then to draw from it appropriate lessons of instruction. But he has no stereotyped form of discourse. His introductions are always

¹ *The Parables of our Saviour*, Expounded and Illustrated. By William M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1886.

appropriate and interesting, and his expositions remarkable for the clearness with which they set forth the thought. Often a happy illustration pours a flood of light upon the subject. He does not attempt to find more in a parable than there is in it, and shows both good sense and good exegesis in his interpretations. The insight and skill manifested in seeing and setting forth the various principles, suggestions, and lessons of the parables are remarkable. Sometimes the preacher condenses the teachings of a parable into a few practical remarks at the close of the discourse. The style is familiar yet dignified, and the application of the truth tender but faithful.

As an example of practical and effective preaching on the parables of our Lord, we know of no better volume of discourses than this of Dr. Taylor.

Two volumes of Mr. Spurgeon's sermons, and a volume of his Sermon-Notes, have been recently given to the American press.¹ The characteristics of the great London preacher are too well known to need specification. The sermons in the volume entitled *Storm Signals* are mainly addressed to those that are not Christians. We have never seen more truthful, faithful, earnest, and tender presentations of the great themes of the Gospel than these sermons exhibit. In some of them the earnestness of the

¹ *Storm Signals*, being a Collection of Sermons preached at the Metropolitan Tabernacle on Sunday and Thursday evenings, by C. H. Spurgeon. New York, Robert Carter & Bros.

First Healing and then Service, and Other Sermons. By C. H. Spurgeon. New York, Robert Carter & Bros.

My Sermon-Notes, a Selection from Outlines of Discourses Delivered at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, with Anecdotes and Illustrations. By C. H. Spurgeon. From Matthew to Acts—cxxx. to cxlv. New York, Robert Carter & Bros., 1886.

preacher is almost tremendous. It would seem as if nothing could withstand his expostulations and entreaties. These sermons reveal the secret of the power of this great preacher — a man so filled with the truth of the Gospel, and so alive to the infinite peril of impenitent men, that he seizes whatever truth may best serve his purpose, and sets it forth in the strongest and most vivid language possible. His sentences glow with life and energy. His illustrations, often homely, are always to the point, and feather his arrows of truth. He is master of the Anglo-Saxon speech, and shows that he has not studied John Bunyan in vain.

The volume entitled *First Healing and then Service, and Other Sermons*, though having similar characteristics to the first named, contains abler discourses. Rarely do we find in either volume the sentiment of the text embodied in the form of a single proposition. The preacher's favorite methods of treating a text are the textual and the inferential, in the use of which he often shows great skill, though at times his plans seem a little fanciful. The prominence which he gives to his divisions, and the clearness and brevity of their statement, are worthy of praise. His applications of the truth are discriminating, faithful, and tender.

We heartily commend to young preachers the sermons, as a whole, in these two volumes, as good examples of a kind of preaching greatly needed and greatly blessed of God.

In the Preface to his *Sermon-Notes*, Mr. Spurgeon, after remarking that they consist of notes of sermons preached by him on Sabbath and Thursday evenings, adds, "I trust that they will be helpful to men who are greatly occupied,

and are therefore sorely pressed for subjects of discourse. I hope and believe that these Notes will not be of much use to persons who fail to think for themselves. For such talkers I have no sort of compassion. My outlines are meant to be aids to preparation, and nothing more. The theory that they will induce men to be idle is not supported by facts. Concerning this, information of the most reliable kind is forthcoming. Those who have valued them, and turned them to account, have almost always used them in the manner which I proposed to them; they have cut them up into several sermons, or have taken the raw material and rearranged it after their own fashion, and so have made it as good as new. In several instances brethren who have been necessarily occupied in visitation and other pastoral work have found great assistance from these summaries, and have been able on the Lord's day to give their people a fair measure of spiritual food, by working out at full length the thoughts suggested. Knowing what it is to be hardly pressed myself, and remembering my great gratitude when a friend has suggested a theme and a line of thought, I am now happy in rendering to others a service which I have so often needed myself."

Now, we fear that it will be just those "persons who fail to think for themselves," and for whom our author has "no sort of compassion," that will haste in largest numbers to use and abuse his Sermon-Notes. The ministers who are wont to do their own thinking will not, whether "sorely pressed" or not, be apt to resort to cut-and-dried plans of sermons made by others. They will have too much respect for themselves and their congregations for that. Besides, they well know that the tendency of resorting to other men's thoughts and plans of sermons

whenever "hardly pressed" will be to rely more and more upon such aid, until the use of such homiletical crutches will almost surely end in pulpit impotence. Aside from the fact that one can never use the sermon-plan of another as well as if it were the result and embodiment of his own thinking, he must, if he is a minister of sensitive conscience, feel that it is hardly consistent with the highest Christian morality to present to his people a plan or a sermon of another, without due acknowledgment. There can be no doubt that the careful study of good sermon-plans, or, what is far better, of good sermons themselves, is very useful to a young preacher; but let him never go forth to battle in Saul's armor. He will become a power in the pulpit only as he shall become able to think out the truth for himself, and to put it into forms adapted to his own way of thinking.

Coming now to notice these sixty-five Sermon-Notes of our author, we find that they are on texts taken from the four Gospels and the Acts. The plans are almost wholly textual and inferential, and they have the same general characteristics as the sermons of the two volumes above named. They are often ingenious in structure; and sometimes both the topic or heading of the plan and the plan itself seem fanciful. Thus the sermon on the text John xx. 15: "Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou?" has, as its designation, "A Handkerchief;" and that on the text Acts iv. 14: "And beholding the man which was healed standing with them, they could say nothing against it," has, as its heading, "The Golden Muzzle." In his plan on the text Acts xxviii. 2: "And the barbarous people showed us no little kindness; for they kindled a fire, and received us every

one, because of the present rain, and because of the cold," he closes the introduction with the remark, "There may be spiritual as well as physical cold, and for this last the kindling of a fire is needed. This is our present subject." He then gives as the main divisions of the plan the following: "I. That we are very apt to be cold." "II. That there are means of warmth." "III. That we should kindle fires for others." Although these heads are developed with considerable ingenuity, yet we cannot but feel that some of the thoughts are far-fetched. Many, however, of these sixty-five Sermon-Notes are good examples of textual or inferential plans of sermons. The two or three "anecdotes and illustrations" appended to each plan, gathered from various quarters, are mostly pertinent, and may be of some service, though we think that those gotten by means of one's own experience and observation are far better.

The well earned fame of Phillips Brooks as a preacher is so well established that whatever he gives to the press is sure of having numerous and interested readers. In his last volume of *Twenty Sermons*,¹ he has added both to his reputation and to his influence.

Most of these discourses are on rather unusual themes, as, Visions and Tasks; The Mother's Wonder; Standing Before God; The Giant with the Wounded Heel; The Sea of Glass Mingled with Fire; The Beautiful Gate of the Temple; The Sword Bathed in Heaven; An Evil Spirit from the Lord; and the like. Perhaps one of the most striking characteristics of these twenty sermons is that, with only two or three exceptions, the subjects are

¹ *Twenty Sermons*. By Phillips Brooks, Rector of Trinity Church, Boston. Fourth Series. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1887.

gotten from their texts by an accommodation often remote, and, as we must think, sometimes a little fanciful. For example, in his discourse on the text, "The Beautiful Gate of the Temple," he says: "The architecture of the old Jewish Temple may serve us for a parable to-day. The truth that it suggests will be the harmony between a noble undertaking and a beautiful beginning — that every true temple ought to have a beautiful gate." Thus he comes to his theme, "The child's religion, as introductory to the religion of maturity." He seems to delight in drawing, by some law of suggestion, from a simple narrative or statement of a fact, a principle in the spiritual realm for discussion. These sermons, as a whole, are at the farthest remove from doctrinal or expository discourses on the one hand, and from preceptive discourses on the other. Yet they are full of thought, and cannot but be suggestive and helpful to careful readers.

While his introductions always interest us, we are not always convinced of the correctness of his expositions. In the development of his themes he is at his best, and often uses, with marvelous skill, appropriate and beautiful illustrations with which to set forth and adorn his thought. It were easy to quote page after page of such illustrations.

He does not seem to us to state with sufficient clearness and brevity his themes and divisions. This we regard as a serious defect in these sermons.

His style is excellent. It abounds in Anglo-Saxon words, and is simple, clear, elegant, and forceful. Often it is sententious, as in the following quotation from the sermon on Timeliness, from the text, "He hath made everything beautiful in his time": "As you emphasize your life, you must localize and define it. The more truly

and earnestly you come to do anything, the more clearly you will see that you cannot do everything. He who is truly good must be good for something. To be good for everything is to be good for nothing. The strength of a life makes up for and glorifies its specialness. Always the higher a life is, the more it is beautiful in its place, and can be beautiful nowhere else."

This volume of sermons will doubtless find as many readers as the previous volumes from the same gifted pen have found.

The volume entitled *The Transfiguration of Christ*,¹ by the Rev. Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus, D.D., pastor of Plymouth Church, Chicago, consists of eight lectures or discourses, on The Nature and Method of Christian Thinking ; The Time of the Transfiguration ; The Place of the Transfiguration ; The Transfigured Christ ; The Appearance of Moses ; The Appearance of Elias ; Jesus Only ; The Transfiguration and the Resurrection.

These topics the author discusses with much originality and varied learning. In his first lecture, introductory to his general theme, he shows that "the nature and method of Christian thinking flow out of the nature of the Christian life — the hiding of the soul, *i. e.*, the life, with Christ in God — the mastery by the Christ of the human spirit, inclusive, as the spirit is, of the concerns and destiny of intellect, sensibilities, and will." This lecture is quite original and suggestive.

In the lecture on The Time of the Transfiguration, he says : "The time of the transfiguration is the moment when the earth and skies demand it ; and with an imperial

¹ *The Transfiguration of Christ*. By Rev. Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1886.

consciousness of what His life is — a consciousness that never seems less spontaneous when it is most august — He unites the threads of his past teaching with those unseen as yet in the future, in the glory of transfiguration. It carries out the unity of God as incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth. The choice of that night is as truly illustrative of the divinity of Christ as is anything that He said. The transfiguration itself was the next fact which was to continue the revelation of God in Him. And so, ‘after six days,’ or, as Luke is less definite, ‘about an eight days after these sayings, He took them into a mountain apart.’ ”

While he regards the place of the transfiguration as “most probably one of the spurs of Hermon,” he remarks: “Uncertain as this must ever be, the place of the transfiguration of Jesus Christ in the unnamed holy land of the spiritual life is more sure. The mountain-height on which naturally such an issuing forth of the Infinite through the finite ever occurs, is a result from the operation of forces, of which the strata of the spiritual world preserve the record. As a physical relationship appears to the geologist between Sinai, Hermon, and Calvary, so these seemingly isolated points in the experience of the human soul may be seen to have been uplifts from the level plain of consciousness, by the action of resistless spiritual forces.” He dwells on the fact that “in Jesus Christ, the seen and the unseen were in unique companionship;” that “the place of the transfiguration was not only a place where Jesus was thus related to nature; it was a place also where He related Himself with the universe in prayer;” and that “the place of the transfiguration was a place of solitude and yet of companionship.”

In his lecture on *The Transfigured Christ*, the author says "that the fact that the 'Lamb of God' came into the world 'to take away the sins of the world' includes and makes necessary the fact of his glorification, beginning on Hermon, triumphant at the grave of Joseph, and so complete in its transformation of His physical self that on the day of ascension earth and heaven are one; His sacred feet, so long homeless, and once so cruelly scarred, miss the rocks of Olivet, and soon Jesus is at home again, the enthroned Logos on the right hand of God the Father. The atonement involves all these steps and processes. It is the reconciliation of all that is human to the divine."

In the author's view, "The appearance of the great law-giver in the glory of Christ's transfiguration has this significance, — the law has brought the world to Christ. In the glory of Christ, Moses had a right to stand. It has also the significance that Moses, as the giver of the law, has yielded now to this new law-giver, Jesus, the Christ of God."

The significance of the appearance of Elias at the transfiguration lay in the fact that, as Christ is the fulfilment of all law, so He is the fulfilment of all prophecy.

In his lecture on *Jesus Only*, the author finely says, "Let us pause, rather, and notice that Christ is not visible in the light of their transfiguration, but that Moses and Elias are visible in the glory of the Christ. Our modern Christianity flaunts its weakness in its ready acceptance of patronage. We are so superficial in our Christian life that we bless literature and science for coming where they certainly must come, or be unseen of mankind. Christ, the transfigured, is the transfigurer of these.

Take Him from history, and on what mountain-top could our modern law-givers and prophets gather?"

In the lecture that closes the volume, *The Transfiguration and the Resurrection*, our author says, "The life of Jesus was one process of divine self-manifestation. His transfiguration marks one of its stages; His resurrection marks another. The same latent power which made His face shine at Hermon carried His body at a later day through the broken sepulcher and past the Roman guard. In one, Christ's 'power' was manifested as 'glory;' in the other, his 'glory' was manifested as 'power.'"

We have made these somewhat lengthy quotations from the volume, because they seemed necessary to give to our readers a proper understanding of the nature and scope of the thought. The author is an independent and original thinker, often profound, and at times a little mystical, but always suggestive and interesting. Now and then, he seems to see more in a passage of Scripture than there is in it. Frequently we meet with such suggestive passages as the following:—"The religions before Christ were efforts from earth toward heaven; the religion of Christ is the effort of heaven toward the earth." "In the twilight of our time, a mind which has felt the intellectual lordship of Christ can stand bewildered in the glory of a transfiguration, because its eyes are filled with infinities; but it sees a philosophy without the infinite dashed into pieces, even by the soft-falling dew."

We look upon these original and suggestive discourses as the first fruits of a harvest of good things that may be expected from the gifted author of this little volume.

INDEX.

ABBEY, 231
 Abraham, His Life and Times, 64
 Acts, Martyr, 145
 Acts of Peter and Paul, 142
 Acts, The, 76, 83, 84, 104
 Al Kady, Apology of, 162
 Allard, 147
 Allen, Prof. J. H., 235
 Amherst, 213
 Amos, 26, 27
 Antinomians in England, 204
 Apocalypse, The, 84, 85, 88, 89, 91
 Apocrypha, New Testament, 73
 Apologetics, 252
 Apostolate, The, 163, 164, 168
 Appeal, The, to Life, 367
 Applied Christianity, 354
 Aramaic, Relation to Hebrew, 6
 Ark of the Covenant, 36
 Art in the Early Church, 171
 Assyrian, Relation to Hebrew, 6
 Augustine, Teachings of, 158, 159, 160, 161

 BAER, 13
 Baker, S., 346
 Barnabas, Epistle of, 152
 Bar Sudaili, Stephen, 161
 Bartlett, 18
 Baumgartner, 28
 Bayne, Prof. Peter, 202
 Beattie, F. R., 245
 Behm, 152
 Behrends, Dr. A. J. F., 358
 Bennett, W. H., 4, 5
 Benrath, 205
 Berger, 197
 Beyschlag, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100
 Biblical Difficulties, Hand-book of, 29
 Bibliotheca Sacra, 165

Bible Study, Inductive, 29
 Bigg, 157, 267, 269
 Bixby, 227
 Blair, 188
 Böhringer, 194
 Bowne, Prof. B. P., 248, 249, 250
 Bradley, Prof. C. F., 107
 Bredenkamp, 24
 Briggs, 68, 122
 Brooks, Rev. Arthur, 381
 Brooks, Phillips, 393
 Bruce, Prof. A. B., 259, 261, 262

 CÆCILIA, St., 145
 Canon, N. T., History of, 73, 74, 75
 Carpenter, Prof. E., 168
 Carriere, 194
 Caspari, Prof., 198
 Catacombs, 172, 173
 Chaldaea, History of, 66
 Character, Creed and, 378
 Cheyne, 44, 45
 Christ at the Door of the Heart, 377
 Christ, The Life of, in the World, 381
 Christ, The Transfiguration of, 395
 Christianity, Applied, 354
 Christianity, Gentile, 154, 155
 Christianity, Jewish, 153, 154
 Christianity, Socialism and, 358
 Christianity, Spread of, 137
 Christians in time of Constantine, 149
 Church, The Apostolic, 110, 111; in Britain, 148; Celtic, 148; Constitution of, 163, 181; The Greek, 214; Idea of, 110, 111; Luther's Idea of, 206; The Modern, 201; Poets of the, 338; The Roman Catholic, 208; in Rome, 78; Russian, 215

- Churches, The American, 233
 Churches, The German, 219
 Church Life, 198
 Church Life in Holland and Belgium, 218
 Clark, F. E., 318
 Clergy, English, Support of, 315
 Clergy and the Labor Question, The, 355
 Commentary, Meyer's, 117, 120
 Commentary, The Speaker's, 110
 Commentary, Edited by Strack and Zöckler, 115
 Constance, Council of, 185, 186
 Corinth, Church of, 76, 77, 78
 Corinthians, First Epistle to, 118
 Cornely, 73
 Cornill, 11, 12, 25, 26
 Cotterill, Bishop, 284
 Courdaveaux, 141
 Crane, 28
 Creed and Character, 378
 Creighton, Prof. M., 209
 Cunningham, 159, 160
- D'AVENEL, 216, 217
 D'Eichthal, 43
 Delitsch, Prof. Fred, Prolegomena, 6
 Denifle, H., 178, 189, 193, 194
 De Rossi, 173, 176, 177
 Deuteronomiker, 34
 Deuteronomy, 20, 43
 Deutsch, 48
 De Waal, 173
 Didron, 174
 Dike, S. W., 341
 Dillmann, 16, 19, 20, 38f
 Discourses upon Holy Scripture;
 The People's Bible, 375
 Division, Historic, 131
 Dix, Morgan, 377
 Doctrine, History of, 150, 190
 Dominicans, The, 189, 190, 194
 Dorner, 151, 192, 285, 286, 307
 Doyle, 233, 234
 Driver, 37f
 Duckett, 187
- EDUCATOR, Theological, 92
 Ehrle, 188, 189
 Elias of Nisibis, 162
 Ellicott, 119
- Elohist, Second, 33, 34, 41, 42
 English in America, 233
 Episcopate, Development of, 168, 169, 182, 183
 Epistles, Catholic, 75, 81, 128
 Epistles of Paul, 75, 76, 77
 Erbes, 145
 Eschatology, 297
 Ethics, 285
 Eucken, 192
 Evidence, Christian, 266
 Exegesis, New Testament, 115
 Exegetical Work, 18ff
 Expositor, The, 62, 79, 80
 Ezekiel, 25, 26
- FARNAM, Prof. Henry W., 355
 Faucon, 177
 Felten, 184
 First Healing and then Service, 390
 Fisher, Prof. G. P., 112
 Fourth Gospel, Genuineness of, 83
 Frank, Prof., 220, 221
 Franke, 120
 Freeman, 134, 135
 Frothingham, 161
- GALATIANS, Epistle to, 119
 Gardiner, 204
 Gebhardt, 91
 Gebhardt, 189
 Gelzer, 183, 190
 Genesis, 18, 19
 George, 32
 Gihl, 212
 Ginsburg, Massora, 13
 Gladden, Washington, 321-322, 354
 Gloag, 81, 128
 Gnosticism, 80, 155, 157
 God, Idea of, 247
 God, Self-Revelation of, 239
 Godet, 75, 78, 79, 108, 109, 111, 119
 Görres, 146
 Gospel, The Fourth, 83
 Gospels, The, 74, 75, 81, 83
 Gospels, Miraculous Element in, 259
 Gospels, Synoptic, 83
 Gossrau, 18
 Gottschick, 206
 Grammatical Studies, 3ff
 Great Britain, Churches of, 228
 Greeley, 193

- Grimm, Lexicon of, 105, 107, 108,
 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 125
 Gunning, 16, 17, 54ff
 Gunsaulus, Rev. Frank Wakeley, 395
 Guthe, 50ff
 Gwynn, J., 91

 HABAKKUK, 28
 Hackett, 110
 Hall, Isaac, 90
 Hallowell, 234
 Hand-books for Bible Classes, 333
 Häring, Prof., 226
 Harnack, 21, 58, 84, 153, 154, 155,
 157, 165, 166, 167, 168
 Harper, Prof. W. R., 3
 Harris, Prof. Samuel, 239, 241, 243,
 249
 Harris, Prof. R., 167
 Hasenclever, 172
 Hatch, E., 165, 166, 168, 181, 183,
 232
 Hatfield, 338
 Hauck, Prof. A., 149, 150
 Haupt, 196, 197
 Healing, First, and then Service,
 390
 Heard, 215
 Hebraica, 4
 Hebrew MSS., 15
 Hebrew Text, Corruption in, 7
 Heidenhain, 203
 Heinrichi, 119
 Hell, Christ's Descent to, 127, 128
 Helvetic Formula of Consensus, 8
 Heretics, Death of, 158
 Hermann, Rabbi, 169
 Herrmann, Prof., 226
 Heywood, 236
 Hierotheos, Book of, 161
 Hilgenfeld, Prof. A., 154, 155
 Hints and Helps for the People of
 the Churches, 360
 Histories, Ancient, 62
 History, Egyptian, 65
 History, New Testament, 95
 History, Old Testament, 54
 History, Schools of, 132, 133
 Hoenig, 227
 Holland, Rev. H. S., 378
 Holsten, 81, 82, 83
 Holtzmann, Prof. H., 73, 74, 80
 Hommel, 67
 Hore, A. H., 229
 Horst, 43, 162
 Howard, 62
 Hüffer, 191
 Huguenots, The, 216
 Hyvernât, 149

 INSPIRATION, Old Testament, Essen-
 tial, 11
 Interpretation, New Testament, 105
 Introduction, New Testament, 73
 Introduction, Old Testament, 30ff
 Isaiah, 24, 50ff

 JACOB of Edessa, 199
 Janssen, Prof., 209
 Jehovahist, 34, 41
 Jennings, 233
 Jeremiah, 13, 24, 43
 Jesus, Life of, 95
 Job, 45-47
 Joel, 26, 52f
 Johannes, 27
 Joshua, 20
 Jostes, 196
 Journal of Society of Bible Exegesis,
 119
 Jukes, Andrew, 283
 Jülicher, 125, 126

 KAULEN, 73, 74, 79, 81
 Kay, 119
 Kayser, 199
 Keller, 197
 Kings, 20, 22
 Kitchen, 187
 Kliefoth, Th., 297
 Klostermann, 14, 15, 20, 22
 Knowledge, Man's, of Man and of
 God, 382
 Koffmane, 211, 214
 Kohlbauer, 62
 Kraus, Prof., 171
 Kreyer, 142
 Krishna, 23
 Krüger, 159

 LABOR QUESTION, The Clergy and
 the, 355
 Languages, Semitic and Indo-Euro-
 pean, 5, 6

- Lea, H., 198
 Le Blant, 173, 174
 Lecky, 231
 Legends in History, 133, 134
 Lévy, Rabbi E., 62
 Lexicon of New Testament, 105, 114
 Lias, J. J., 118, 284
 Library, Vatican, 176, 177, 178, 179
 Life, The Appeal to, 367
 Life, The, of Christ in the World,
 381
 Lightfoot, Bishop, 112, 163, 164, 165
 Lilly, 132
 Lindsay, 107, 117
 Link, 150
 Lipsius, 142, 143
 Lloyd, 20
 Lucifer of Calaris, 159
 Logos, The, 156, 157
 Loman, Prof., 138
 Loserth, 201, 202
 Lowe, Hebrew Grammar, 3
 Löwenfeld, 179, 180
 Lumley, 22
 Luthardt, 79, 115, 116, 117, 226

 MACCABEAN PSALMS, 50
 Man's Knowledge of Man and of God,
 382
 Man, The New, 283
 Man, The Service of, 287
 Mangold, 81
 Marriage Ring, The, 387
 Martens, 184
 Martyrs, 146, 147
 Martyrs in Venice, 205
 Massorettes, 10, 15
 Massoretic Text, 8, 9, 12, 16, 17, 25
 McDowall, 188
 McIlvaine, J. H., 120, 123
 McPherson, J., 167
 Meyer, 107, 108, 110, 119, 120
 Meyer, E., 65
 Methods, Historic, 131
 Micah, 26, 27
 Middle Ages, Church of, 176
 Milligan, W., 88
 Ministers as Business Men, 312
 Miracles of Jesus, 97, 98, 100
 Moabite Stone, 11
 Money, 204
 Monks of the Middle Ages, 187

 Montet, 196
 Montanism, 148, 167
 Moody, D. L., 348
 Morison, James, 118, 288, 292
 Müller, Prof. K., 185, 196, 197
 Munger, T. T., 324, 367, 369
 Münz, 171, 180
 Mystics, German, 193
 Myth, 31, 32
 My Sermon Notes, 390

 NABER, 139
 Nero in Apocalypse, 112, 113
 Nestorians, The, 162, 163
 New Testament, Word Studies in,
 124
 Newton, R, 376
 Nicoll, Rev. W. Robertson, 3, 92
 Nöldeke, Semitic Languages, 5
 Nösgen, C. F., 115, 116
 Numbers, 20

 OBADIAH, 27
 Orelli, 22, 24, 25
 Organization of Early Church, 80
 Ossian, Prayer of, 195
 Overton, 231
 Oxenden, Bishop, 329

 PAPACY, The Mediæval, 183
 Parables, The, 125
 Parables, The, of our Saviour, 388
 Parish Problems, 321, 360
 Parish Work, 317
 Parker, Dr. Joseph, 375
 Parson, The English Country, 313
 Paul, Conversion of, 103, 104
 Paul, Death of, 112
 Paul, Dr., 156
 Paul's Epistles, Origin of, 138, 139
 Paulinism, 82
 Peabody, 236
 Pearson, 52f
 Pentateuch Criticism, 37
 People's Bible, The; Discourses
 upon Holy Scripture, 375
 Persecutions in Third Century, 147
 Peters, 18
 Pfeleiderer, Prof. E., 155
 Pharisees, The, 102
 Philo and the Alexandrian School,
 157

- Phœnician Language, Relation to Hebrew, 6
 Pierson, 139
 Pietism, History of, 219
 Platonists, The Christian, of Alexandria, 157, 267
 Plummer, 120, 121
 Popes, History of, 209
 Pressensé, 142
 Priests' Code, 43, 44
 Priscillian, 158, 159
 Probation, Future, 306
 Problems, Parish, 360
 Prophecy, Messianic, 68
 Protestants in Austria, 215
 Proverbs, 47, 48
- QUAKERS in New England, 234
- RÄBIGER, 77
 Ragozin, Madame Z. A., 66
 Rawlinson, Prof., 64, 66
 Reformation, The, 201
 Renaissance, The, 133
 Resurrection, The, 100, 103, 140
 Retribution, Future, 303
 Revelation, Book of, 75
 Review, The Andover, 80, 95, 363
 Review, The Methodist, 107
 Review, The Unitarian, 227, 235, 236, 341
 Revision Company, Old Testament, 8
 Reuter, Prof., 158
 Ritschl, Prof. A., 219, 220, 224, 225
 Ritschl, School of, 58, 153
 Robinson, 66
 Rochall, 192
 Romans, Commentary on, 118
 Rome, Importance of, 134
 Rosenzweig, Rabbi, 62
 Row, Prebendary, 266, 303
 Ryssel, 13, 14, 27
- SADDUCEES, The, 102
 "Sage," 31, 32
 Samuel, 20
 Sanday, Prof., 90, 165, 166, 167
 Savoureux, 9, 13
 Schaff, Prof. P., 109, 112, 113
 Schegg, 22
 Schepss, 143, 158, 159
 Schmidt, 185
 Schmidt, Prof. Hermann, 224, 226
 Schnedermann, G., 78, 115, 117
 Scholz, 26
 School, The Sunday, 331
 Schultze, Prof. Victor, 148
 Schürer, 21, 58, 100, 101, 102
 Schenz, 35
 Scrivener, 92
 Scudder, H. M., 327
 Sell, 221
 Seneca and Paul, 142
 Septuagint Version, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 25
 Sermons to Children, 376
 Sermon Distribution, The Stöcker, 363
 Sermon Notes, My, 389, 390
 Sermons, Twenty, 393
 Seufert, 163, 164
 Shea, 214
 Shepherd of Hermas, 150, 151
 Shulamith, 22, 23
 Sieffert, 119
 Siegfried, 9
 Smith, Prof. H. P., 13
 Smith, Dr. Richard Travers, 382
 Smith, Prof. Robertson, 60, 68
 Smyth, Newman, 252, 257, 258, 259
 Socialism and Christianity, 358
 Society of Christian Endeavor, 317
 Sociology, Christian, 341
 Solomon's Song, 22
 Sources, Literature of, in Middle Ages, 176ff
 Spurgeon, C. H., 389
 Spyridion, Legend of, 143, 144
 Stade, Prof. B., 57, 59, 60
 Steiner, 203
 Stelhorn, F. W., 114
 Stevenson, 203
 Stevenson, Henry, 176
 Stöcker Sermon Distribution, The, 363
 Stokes, Prof., 148
 Storm Signals, 389
 Strack, 24, 115
 Strong, Prof. A. H., 271, 279
 Stubbs, Bishop, 131, 201
 Symonds, 133, 232
- TALMAGE, T. DE WITT, 387
 Talmudical Period, 9

- Tamm, 127
 Targum, 12
 Targums on Ruth and Jonah, 28
 Taylor, Dr. William M., 388
 Tenses, Hebrew, 3-5
 Text, New Testament, 90
 Texts, Old Latin Biblical, 90
 Textual Studies, 8ff
 Thayer, Prof. J. H., 105, 106, 107,
 111
 Theism, 239
 Theism, Methods of, 245
 Theism, Philosophy of, 248
 Thenn, 143
 Theology, Liberal Movement in, 235
 Theology, New Testament, 125
 Theology, Old Testament, 68
 Theology, Pauline, 152, 153, 158
 Theology of the Reformation, 207
 Theology, Systematic, 271
 Thomas Aquinas, 192
 Thomas, R., 346
 Tiele, 67
 Times, The Patriarchal, 63
 Tosaphists, 49
 Transfiguration, The, of Christ, 395
 Translations, Waldensian, of Bible,
 196, 197
 Tübingen, School of, 75, 78, 102, 116
 Tuck, 29
 Twenty Sermons, 393

 ULTRAMONTANISM, 212
 Unitarianism, 235
 Usener, 144, 191
 Usteri, J. M., 127, 128

 VACATIONS, Ministers', 311
 Van der Bergh, 137

 Van Manen, 137, 138
 Vatke, 30ff
 Vernes, 43
 Vincent, M. R., 124, 311, 312
 Vischer, E., 84, 85, 86, 87, 88
 Vogler, 150
 Von Bohlen, 32
 Von Sybel, 133
 Vowel Points, Inspired, 8

 WALSH, Bishop, 63
 Warfield, B., 93, 94, 119
 Warnings, Bible, 376
 Warren, I. P., 122, 123
 Wattenbach, 198
 Weidmann, 65
 Weiss, Prof. B., 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79,
 80, 81, 83, 84, 95, 96, 100, 117
 Weizsäcker, C., 102, 140, 141, 168,
 170
 Wellhausen, 33, 102
 Weymouth, R. F., 91, 92
 White, H., 90
 Whitelaw, 63
 Wiedemann, 215
 Wilpert, 173
 Winterstein, 169
 Wisdom Literature, 44
 Withrow, 163
 Wolf, F. A., 36
 Woodbury, F. P., 326
 Woodruff, 80
 Wordsworth, J., 90
 Worship, Christian, 169
 Worship, Public, 336

 ZAHN, Dr. A., 214, 222, 224
 Zahn, Prof. Theodore, 151
 Zöckler, 21, 83, 115, 116, 117



Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01245 1540

POLE POSITION

1944 5 1000

GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

